



The Primitive Doctrine of CHRIST's Divinity:

O R, A

S P E C I M E N

O F

A full View of the *Ante-nicene* Doctrine,

I N A N

E S S A Y

O N

I R E N Æ U S.

Wherein all the decisive Passages are collected and methodiz'd : The Sense of disputed Expressions enquir'd into, and determin'd : The Principles, into which his Reasonings are resolv'd, extracted, and improv'd for clearing up his Scheme : And his Consistency with himself is demonstrated.

By JOHN ALEXANDER.

*Fortasse mireris, quod tantum facinus audeam. Patiemur ne igitur
extingui aut opprimi Veritatem? Ego vero libentius vel sub
hoc onere defecerim. Lactant. de Op. Dei. Cap. 20.*

*Καὶ πάλιν ἰχθύσωσι, καὶ πάλιν ἐτηθήσονται. Eustath. Antioch. apud
Theodor. H. E. Lib. 1. Cap. 8.*

L O N D O N :

Printed for JOHN CLARK and RICHARD HETT, at the
Bible and Crown in the Poultry. M.DCC.XXVII.



T H E

P R E F A C E.

THE following Collection is a Specimen of a Method to determine a controverted Point of Fact, viz. *What was the Sense of the Ante-nicene Fathers concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity and our Saviour's Divinity?* For as to the Stress to be laid on their Authority in Controversies of Faith, I meddle not with it. I see all Parties would be glad to have them on their Side: And I confess, it affords me a sensible Pleasure to observe, that the Scripture-Doctrine in this momentous Point, was so long preserved pure and uncorrupted in the Christian Church. I cannot bear, that the Memory of Persons eminent for primitive Zeal and Holiness should be treated with Contempt; as their other Accomplishments were far from being Contemptible, so the real Proofs that they gave of their Love to Christ and his Truth by

resisting even unto Blood, oblige us to honour and esteem 'em. But *I adore the Fulness of the Scriptures*^{*}: and if any one should thrust away my Bible, to make room for their orthodox and learned Works, I cannot tell, whether I could observe due Decorum in repelling such an Attempt.

I only appeal to them as competent Witnesses of the Primitive Doctrine of Christ's Divinity, as held by themselves, and reputed Apostolical and Scriptural in their Time. And considering it as a Fact, or Point of Christian Antiquity, I see no Cause to despair of its being determin'd with a good degree of Certainty: Since we still have many valuable Monuments of Antiquity, in which they explain and defend the great Points of Christian Faith, it may justly be matter of Wonder, if an impartial Enquirer cannot find out their real Doctrine. Indeed, while we content our selves with a general View of the Fathers, and only catch at a few broken Passages, applying 'em to a particular Purpose, we may find something to say on both Sides, and dispute on long enough. But

^{*} *Terbult. adv. Hermogen:*
H. 22.

I have

I have been long persuaded, that it is not impossible to find out a Method, that would bid fair to bring our Debates about this Fact to a good Issue.

In order to this, I cannot think of any more unexceptionable and safe Method, than to take a full View of all the *Ante-nicene* Writers say on this great Point, and so to methodize the several Passages, that those of the like Import may by their Harmony carry the stronger Evidence with them, and more general and ambiguous Expressions may be illustrated by those of a more clear and determinate Sense. And then to clear up any remaining Obscurities, and to carry the Matter to the utmost degree of Certainty it is capable of, it may be of good Use, not only to call in all the Aids that solid Criticism will afford, but accurately to enquire into the Maxims and Principles those Authors go upon in their Reasonings, and make use of them to determine their Sense, and find out their Scheme. Words and Sentences may sometimes admit different Senses, and leave room for Evasions: But the Princi-

ples an Author lays Stress on in his Arguments, lead us to his inward Sense. I have observ'd what strange Work they make with the Antients, who bring a Set of Principles of their own to them, and make use of them to determine their Sense, and find out their Opinion concerning particular Points; when, perhaps, they knew nothing of those Principles, but had very different ones in view in their Expressions. And I'm apt to think, that the greatest Injustice is done to Authors, both sacred and others, generally in this way. How far Dr. *Clarke* has been guilty of this unfair dealing in support of his Scheme, has been observed by others: he has made use of some Maxims of his own to draw Consequences from the Primitive Writers, without any Proof of their being owned by them, or so much as known to them. But to them that are not servilely disposed to swallow every thing, he has, I think, afforded a Preservative against his own Mistakes, by applying his Maxims to the *Post-nicene* Fathers and other Orthodox Writers, and drawing Consequences from them directly

directly contrary to their known Sentiments. I cannot help thinking, that this is a solid Demonstration, that his way of treating Authors has no Tendency to lead us to their real Sense.

It is not enough, that the Principles, by which we explain an Author's Expressions, and judge of his Scheme be true, or even *self-evident*, but they must be owned by him; else they will not justify our Consequences from him. As for Instance; if any one finding in *Lactantius*, these Words: "*It is impossible, but that every thing that now has a being, must sometime have had a beginning; **" should hastily conclude, that he did not believe the Being of God, upon this self-evident Maxim, viz. *That which is not absolutely eternal, but once had a beginning, is not God*; he would very much misrepresent *Lactantius*, who had no Doubts about the Existence of God, tho' he might hold a Principle really inconsistent with it: Or if he

* Quia fieri non potest, quin id, quod sit, aliquando esse cœperit; consequens est, ut quando nihil ante illum (Deum) fuit, ipse ante omnia ex seipso sit procreatus. Instit. Lib. 1. Cap. 7. p. 18. Ed. Cant.

had said, *That the Father and Son both had a beginning of their Existence, and there was a time when they were not* ; it would not be just to infer, that he deny'd the Divinity of the Father and Son. In like manner, if it was true, that *Origen* deny'd the absolute Omnipotence (*παντοδυναμίας*) of God, as many have supposed*, we could not infer his being of *Arian* Principles, tho' he had deny'd the Son to be Almighty in the same Sense. It would be easy to multiply Instances of this Sort, if the designed Bounds of a short Preface would permit. He that regards only particular Expressions of an Author, without minding the Principles that are the *Substratum* of his Reasonings, goes no deeper than the Surface, and can scarcely avoid often drawing wrong Consequences from his Words: But he that finds out his Principles, penetrates into his Scheme, and by an allowable Inquisition draws his inward Sense from him. The former, for want of a Key, will find, it may be, many Obscurities and seeming Inconsistencies in him :

* Vid. Huet. *Origenian*. Lib. 11. Cap. 2. Q. 1. pp. 28, 29.

but the latter will see, that he is not so often at Variance with himself, as the hasty and superficial Reader is apt to suppose.

This Method I have endeavoured to exemplify in the following Sheets, by giving a full View of all the decisive, together with many illustrating and corroborating Passages of *Irenæus*, whether seeming to be for or against the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, and our Saviour's Godhead. I have placed 'em in such a Light and Order, as, I hope, will give no just Cause of Complaint. And have labour'd to make him, as much as might be, his own Interpreter. And if any learned Reader will be at the Pains to take his Meaning along with his Words, and treat him with common Justice and Candor, which, I think, is due to dead as well as living Authors, I doubt not, but he will find him entirely consistent with himself.

Had I been to chuse an Arbitrator in the Controversy of the Trinity, and a Witness of the Doctrine of the Primitive Church, before the Rise of *Arianism*, I don't see, that any just Exception could
a have

have been made by either Side against *Irenæus*. He lived so near the Apostolic Age, that he was a Disciple of good old *Polycarp*, an Apostolical Man, and faithful Martyr of Christ, who learned his Doctrine from the Apostle *John*, that great Asserter of his beloved Master's Divinity; and was by him (*John*) appointed Bishop of *Smyrna*. This we learn from *Irenæus* himself, who in his Epistle to *Florinus*, lately fallen into Heresy, writes to this Purpose: “ * The Elders of the last Age,
 “ who were the immediate Disciples of the
 “ Apostles, never taught you these Doc-
 “ trines. For when I was but very young
 “ in the lower *Asia* with *Polycarp*, I saw

* Apud Euseb. H. E. Lib.V. Cap. 20. ---Ταῦτα τὰ δόγματα, οἱ παρ' ἡμῶν πρεσβύτεροι, οἱ καὶ τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις συμφοιτήσαντες, ἔπαρέδωκάν σοι. εἶδον γάρ σε παῖς ὢν ἔτι ἐν τῇ κατὰ Ἀσίαν παρὰ τῷ Πολυκάρπῳ, λαμπρῶς πράττοντα ἐν τῇ Βασιλικῇ αὐλῇ, καὶ πειρώμενον εὐδοκιμεῖν παρ' αὐτῷ. μάλλον ἢ τότε διαμνημονεύω, τῶν ἑναγγέλιον γινόμενων· αἱ ἢ ἐκ παιδῶν μαθήσεις συναυξῆσαι τῇ ψυχῇ, ἐνέονται αὐτῇ· ὥς με δύνασθαι εἰπεῖν καὶ τὸν τόπον, ἐν ᾧ καθιζόμενος διελέγετο ὁ Μακάριος Πολύκαρπος· καὶ τὰς προόδους αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς ἐισόδους· καὶ τὴν χαρακτῆρα τοῦ βίου, καὶ τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἰδίαν· καὶ τὰς διαλέξεις ὡς ἐποιεῖτο πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος· καὶ τὴν μετὰ Ἰωάννης συναγροφὴν ὡς ἀπήγγελλε, καὶ τὴν μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν τῶν ἱερακότων τὸν κύριον· καὶ ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευε τὰς λόγους αὐτῶν, καὶ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου πῶς ἦν ὁ παρ' ἐκείνων ἀκηκοεὶ· καὶ περὶ τῶν δυνάμεων αὐτοῦ, καὶ περὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας, ὡς παρὰ αὐτοπλῶν τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ λόγου παρεληφώς ὁ Πολύκαρπος, ἀπήγγελλε πάντα σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς. ταῦτα καὶ τότε διὰ τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ ἐπ' ἡμοῖς γεγονός σπευδαίως ἔκκον, ὑπομνηματιζόμενος αὐτὰ ἐκ ἐν χαρτῇ, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ ἐμῇ καρδίᾳ· καὶ αἰεὶ διὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ γνησίως αὐτὰ ἀναμνησκώμαι.

“ you

“ you living in great Splendor in the Im-
“ perial Court, and endeavouring to re-
“ commend your self to him. I remem-
“ ber what then passed much better, than
“ much later Occurrences; for those ear-
“ ly Impressions that are made upon us
“ in our tender Years, growing up with
“ us, are deeply inlay’d in the Memory.
“ So that I can tell the very Place where
“ the blessed *Polycarp* sat and discoursed; as
“ also his going out, and coming in, the
“ Manner of his Life, and the Make of
“ his Body. I remember his Sermons to
“ the People, and how he reported, what
“ intimate Conversation he had with (the
“ Apostle) *John*, and others who had seen
“ the Lord: And how he was wont to re-
“ peat their Sayings, and what he had heard
“ from them concerning the Lord. And
“ all that *Polycarp* reported concerning his
“ Miracles and Doctrine, as he had re-
“ ceived of Eye-witnesses of the Word of
“ Life, was agreeable to the Scriptures.
“ These Things, even at that Age, thro’
“ the Mercy of God toward me, I atten-
“ tively heard, and recorded ’em, not on
“ Paper,

“ Paper, but my very Heart; and to this
“ Day, by the Grace of God, I with Plea-
“ sure ruminate upon them.” Thus from
Irenæus’s own Words, wherein he breaths
forth the Apostolical Spirit, we learn how
greedily he imbib’d pure Christian Doc-
trine from the Mouth of holy *Polycarp*;
how much he valu’d it, and how faithful-
ly he retain’d it. And his great Worth,
Abilities and Orthodoxy were so well
known, that he acquired great Authority
in the Church, and learnedly defended its
Doctrine against the antient Hereticks.
He also made a Stand against the first
Workings of a Spirit of Tyranny in the
Roman See, by his celebrated Epistle to
Pope *Victor*, on Behalf of the *Asiatic*
Churches. And I may add, that it does
not appear that he was in the least tinc-
tured with the Notions of any Sect of
Philosophers; lest any should think, he
derived any of his Doctrines from their
Speculations. So that, upon the whole,
I can see no Reason to doubt, but *Ire-
næus*’s Doctrine in this weighty Point,
which lies so near the Center of Christi-
anity,

anity, is the same that the Apostles preached, and the Catholic Church then believed, whereof we cannot easily have a more authentic and unexceptionable Witness, since Inspiration ceased. But my pitching upon him for a Specimen of this Method, was owing to an Accident, that the World is not at all concerned to know.

I have added a short Dissertation on *Prov. viii. 22.* as read by the Fathers in the Septuagint Version. And, another much larger concerning the Use and Import of the Terms *γενητός, ἀγέννητος, γενητός* and *ἀγέννητος* in relation to the Doctrine of the Trinity, in which some Passages of *Irenæus* are more fully considered, is, for some Reasons, reserved for another Opportunity, tho' at first designed to be annexed to this Collection, and sometimes referred to in it.

Thus this small Essay ventures abroad, and is submitted to the Judgment of the Learned and Impartial. If by the Blessing of God it should be in the least serviceable to the Cause of Truth, and the Great Redeemer's Honor, I shall think my Time
 4 and

and Pains well bestow'd. If any impartial Friend, or candid Adversary should discover any Mistake, or important Omission in it, I shall reckon my self obliged to him for giving me Notice of it; and shall not fail to acknowledge it, if ever I should have an Opportunity.

I must confess, I have no great Relish of the vulgar Method of managing Controversies: And therefore if any Writer should *in that Spirit and Way* attack a few Passages, not essential to the Cause I plead, I cannot promise, that I shall pay the Compliment of a Reply to such an Attempt: But if any thing weighty and substantial, that affects the Merits of the Cause, should appear, I shall think my self obliged to take some Notice of it.

And as the Design of this Tract is to enquire into an important Fact, and to furnish the Reader with all the Help that *Irenæus* could afford, to settle his Judgment concerning it; I am not at all concern'd, that the Heat of the Controversy is over, before it appears in the World. For, tho' some may overlook it upon that Score,
yet,

yet, I hope, the allaying of Mens Heats will rather make room for a cool and impartial Consideration of an Essay, not written in the Method and Spirit of Controversy, nor designed to raise Mens Passions, but to clear up a Point of Christian Antiquity.

I only add, that even in case the World should not encourage the Author to carry this Design any further, in a like View of other *Ante-Nicene* Writers, the Method here exemplified may yet be of some Use to those that would not take Things upon Trust, but acquaint themselves with *Primitive Christianity*, by going to the Fountain-head, and reading the Fathers themselves.

E R R A T A.

PAGE 36. line 25. read, ~~but~~ self-existent. p. 61. l. 10. Not. r. *locutus*. p. 96. l. 4. Not. r. *ἀπορίφασονται*. p. 136. l. 26. for *have*, r. *leave*. p. 145. l. 8. Not. r. *ἵς τε*. p. 149. l. 7. r. *indictâ*. p. 172. l. 26. r. *κτεθίσονται*.

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

SOME General Principles, either plainly express'd, or into which his Reasonings must necessarily be resolv'd. Page 1.

CHAP. II.

Passages relating to the two distinct Natures, the Divine and Human, united in the Person of Christ. p. 8.

CHAP. III.

The Passages, wherein the Father, Son and Spirit are mention'd. p. 16.

CHAP. IV.

General Passages relating to Christ's Deity. p. 37.

CHAP. V.

Passages expressing the Son's Consubstantiality, or being of the same Nature and Essence with the Father: The Generation of the Son considered. p. 60.

CHAP. VI.

The Passages of Scripture understood by Irenæus concerning Christ, which prove his Belief of his Deity. p. 85.

CHAP. VII.

Divine Attributes ascribed to the Son. p. 98.

CHAP. VIII.

The Divine Works of Creation and Providence ascribed to Christ. p. 104.

CHAP. IX.

The Passages pleaded by the Arians. p. 118.

APPENDIX.

Concerning the Holy Ghost. p. 158.

A DISSERTATION on Prov. viii. 22.

Read by the Fathers in the Version of the LXX. *Κύριος ἐποίησέν με Ἄρχην ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ. κ. τ. ε.* That is, The Lord created me in the beginning of his Ways. p. 170.

T H E
P R I M I T I V E D O C T R I N E
O F

C H R I S T's Divinity,
*Set forth in a full Collection of the
passages concerning it in Irenæus.*

C H A P. I.

*Some General Principles, either plainly ex-
press'd, or into which his Reasonings
must necessarily be resolv'd.*

I. *Prin.* **T**HERE is but one only True
God, who created all things.

This *Irenæus* lays the greatest
Stress on, as the first Principle of all Religion,
and uses it as a Test of men's Schemes of Doc-
trine.

“ Since we hold the Rule of Truth, saith he,
“ which is, that there is one God Almighty,

Lib. i. 22. 1. Cum teneamus autem nos regulam veritatis,
id est, quia sit unus Deus omnipotens, qui omnia condidit
per verbum suum. — Hanc ergo tenentes regulam, licet
valde varia & multa dicant, facile eos deviâsse à veritate ar-
guimus. Omnes enim fere quotquot sunt Hæreses, Deum
quidem unum dicunt, sed per sententiam malam immu-
tant; — quemadmodum & gentes per Idololatriam.

B

“ who

“ who created all things by his Word.——
 “ tho’ the Heretics say many things, and of
 “ very different import, we easily shew, that
 “ they depart from the Truth. For almost
 “ all the Heretics own in words but one God,
 “ but by a corrupt meaning change (and un-
 “ dermine this Article)——even as the Gen-
 “ tiles do by their Idolatry.”

To settle the meaning of this first Article, as understood by *Irenæus*, I observe,

1. All the *Gnostics* agreed, that there was but one supream God, who in some point of Eternity, immediately or mediately, produced several other subordinate Powers, of whom the Creator was one : yet *Irenæus* represents ’em, as subverting the Article of the Divine Unity by holding a plurality of Gods, and consequently symbolizing with the idolatrous Gentiles.

2. He expressly denies all *other* Gods, besides the one true God, whether superior, inferior, or co-ordinate. ^a “ The Creator, saith he, is
 “ the only God, and there is no other God be-
 “ sides him.” And he proves, ^b there is no God either above, or beneath him.

3. It unavoidably follows, that, if he held the Son to be God at all, he believ’d him to be the same God with the Father : and when he asserts the *one God and Creator to be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, and says, *He is that God, above whom there is no other God* : he

^a ii. 16. 3. Fabricator Deus hic, qui mundum fecit, solus est Deus, & non est alius Deus præter eum.

^b ii. Præf. Et quia unus Deus conditor,——& quia neque super illum, neque post eum est aliquid.

Confer *Tertullian* adv. *Hermogenem*, c. 7. neque enim proximi erimus opinionibus Nationum, quæ si quando coguntur Deum confiteri, tamen & alios infra illum volunt. Divinitas autem gradum non habet, utpote unica.

must be understood, according to his scope, to exclude the *Valentinian Æons*, which the Heretics plac'd above the Creator, &c. But in consistence with this great Principle of the Unity of God, and his notion of the ineffable Union of the Father and Son, to include the Son in the Father, as always understood to be in, and with him, not as a Creature, or another God, but the same God. The Heretics held one supreme, and many subordinate Gods; *Irenæus* opposes to this Tenet the first Article of the Creed, plainly grounded on Scripture, and universally received in the Churches. But still it would be ask'd, who this one God is? *Irenæus*, in answer to this describes him as the Creator of the World, and the Father of Christ. And that he understood him to be the one God, not exclusive of the Son and Spirit, but, according to the Christian Scheme of Doctrine, having in himself the other two glorious Persons, will appear by comparing two passages.

The former is to this purpose: "This God (i.e. the one God) is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and therefore the Apostle Paul said; *One God the Father, who is over all, and thro' all, and in us all.*"

In another place he explains these words of the whole ever-blessed Trinity, which must therefore be included in the one God, tho' the Father only is expressly mention'd.

—"Thus, saith he, *one God the Father* is manifested, *who is over all, and thro' all, and in*

^c ii. 2. 6. Quoniam autem hic Deus, est pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi; & ideo Paulus Apostolus dixit: *unus Deus pater, qui super omnes, & per omnia, & in omnibus nobis*, Eph. iv. 6.

“ *all.* The Father is over all;—the Word is
 “ thro’ all;—and the Spirit is in us all.^d”

II. *Prin.* All things, besides the uncreated God, had a beginning of their Being, and consequently a precarious Existence and Duration, depending entirely upon the good Pleasure of the Creator: And this is the great Difference between God and the Creature.

In answer to an Objection against the Immortality of the Soul, which is not a necessary Being, because a Creature, he says :

“ Let ’em learn, that God alone, who is
 “ Lord of all, is without beginning and end,
 “ truly and for ever the same, and existing af-
 “ ter the same manner. But all things that
 “ have been, or still are made by him, have a
 “ beginning of their Existence, and for that
 “ reason are inferior to him, that made ’em,
 “ because they are not uncreated. And they
 “ continue their Existence unto Eternity by
 “ the Will of God their Creator: as he gave
 “ ’em their Being at first, so also Continuance
 “ in it^e.

Again: “ God differs from Man in this, that
 “ God makes, and Man is made: And he that

^d v. 18. 2. — Et sic unus Deus pater ostenditur, qui est super omnia, & per omnia, & in omnibus. Super omnia quidem Pater:—per omnia autem Verbum:—in omnibus autem nobis Spiritus.—

^e ii. 34. 2. — Discant, quoniam sine initio & sine fine, verè & semper idem, & eodem modo se habens solus est Deus, qui est omnium Dominus. Quæ autem sunt ab illo omnia, quæcunque facta, & fiunt, initium quidem suum accipiunt generationis, & per hoc inferiora sunt ab eo qui ea fecit. Perseverant autem & extenduntur in longitudinem sæculorum, secundum voluntatem Factoris Dei: ita ut sic initio ferent, & postea ut sint, eis donat.

“ makes

“ makes, is ever the same : but what is made,
 “ must receive a beginning, and succeeding
 “ Space of Existence, and Growth and Im-
 “ provement : And God is the Benefactor,
 “ and Man the Receiver: And God is perfect
 “ in all things, ever like, and equal to him-
 “ self; since he is all Light, all Mind, and all
 “ Substance, and the Fountain of all good
 “ things: But Man is capable of Increase and
 “ Improvement in gradual Approaches toward
 “ God^f.

Again: g “ All created Beings had a begin-
 “ ning : and things that once had a beginning,
 “ are capable of Dissolution, are in Subjection,
 “ and depend upon their Maker.”

III. *Prin.* The want of necessary Existence is the Ground of the Imperfection of all things that had a beginning: an utter Incapacity to receive Perfection is inseparable from a created Being: It must at first pass thro’ a sort of Infancy, and a state of Growth and improvement, and so by slow steps arrive to its design’d *Acme*.

—Upon this principle he accounts for Man’s being not made perfect at first, *i. e.* as knowing, glorious, and incapable of sinning, as he will be in Heaven.

^f iv. 11. 2. Et h c Deus ab homine differt, quoniam Deus quidem facit, homo autem fit: & quidem qui facit, semper idem est; quod autem fit, & initium, & medietatem, & adjectionem, & augmentum accipere debet——& Deus quidem perfectus in omnibus, ipse sibi  qualis & similis; totus cum sit lumen, & totus mens, & totus substantia, & fons omnium bonorum: homo vero profectum accipiens, & augmentum ad Deum.

^g iii. 8. 3. Qu e vero ab eo sunt facta, initium sumpserunt, &c.

v. Locum integrum infra exhibendum.

h “ To

h “ To God, saith he, as being ever the same,
 “ and uncreated, for his own part, all things
 “ are possible : But things made by him, as
 “ they afterwards had a beginning of their Ex-
 “ istence, must for that very reason fall short
 “ of their Maker. For things but lately pro-
 “ duced, could not be necessarily and eternally
 “ existent; and as not necessarily existent, they
 “ must needs come short of Perfection : And
 “ as they are but of yesterday, they are in an
 “ Infant-state ; and consequently for want of
 “ Use and Exercise are incapable of their high-
 “ est Improvement, &c.”

Again : i “ Thus God has the Pre-eminence
 “ in all things, as he alone is uncreated, the
 “ first of all beings, and the Author of the be-
 “ ing of all others :” But all the rest continue
 in subjection to God.—

IV. *Prin.* He that is subject to a Superior,
 cannot be called God, or the great King.

Upon this Principle he argues against them
 that held the Creator to be only a subordinate
 Deity, from *Mat.* v. 34, 35. compared with *Isa.*
 lxvi. 1. Whence it appears, that 'tis the Crea-
 tor, whose Throne Heaven is.

iv. 38. 1. — Τῷ μὲν Θεῷ, αἰεὶ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ὄντι, καὶ
 ἀγεννήτῳ ὑπάρχοντι, ὡς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν πάντα δυνατὰ· τῷ δὲ — γεγε-
 νότῃ, καθὼς μετέπειτα γενέσεως ἀρχὴν ἰδίαν ἔχει, κατὰ τὸτο καὶ ὑπε-
 ρῆναι, εἰ αὐτὰ τῷ πεποιηκότι· ὃ δὲ ἡδυνάμει ἀγεννήτῳ εἶναι
 τὸν νεώτερον· καθὼς δὲ μὴ εἶναι ἀγεννήτῳ, κατὰ τὸτο καὶ
 ὑπερῆναι τῷ τελείῳ· καθὼς δὲ νεώτερον, κατὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμίαν, κατὰ
 τοῦτο καὶ ἀσυνήθη, καὶ ἀγύμναστα πρὸς τὴν τελείαν ἀγωγήν.

i Ibid. 3. — Καὶ οὕτως πρᾶττει μὲν ἐν πᾶσιν ὁ Θεός, ὁ καὶ
 μόνος ἀγεννήτος, καὶ πρῶτος πάντων, καὶ τῶν εἶναι τοῖς πᾶσι πα-
 ρέτι· τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα ἐν ὑποταγῇ μένει τοῦ Θεοῦ.

k “ Besides him, saith he, there is no other
 “ God; else our Lord would never call him
 “ God, or the great King;—For he that has
 “ any Superior above him, and is in the pow-
 “ er of another, can neither be stiled God, nor
 “ the great King.

V. *Prin.* There is no Creature, or Order of Creatures higher, or more excellent, than the Angels.

This Supposition runs thro’ his whole Book; when he ascends to the top of the Creation, he mentions only the several Names, or Orders of Angels¹.

VI. *Prin.* He that is himself a Creature, cannot have Dominion over the Creation.

This is to our Author a self-evident Maxim, by which he confutes the Devil’s claim to a delegated Dominion over this lower World, contain’d in these Words: *All these things are delivered to me, &c.*

* iv. 2. 5. Et præter hunc alius non est Deus; Cæterum à Domino neque Deus, neque magnus Rex diceretur.— Qui enim super se habet aliquem superiorem, & sub alterius potestate est, hic neque Deus, neque magnus Rex dici potest.

’ii. 30. 3. Quid autem illa, quæ super Cælum, & quæ non prætereant, quanta sunt, Angeli, Archangeli, Throni, Dominationes, Potestates innumerabiles?

Ibid. §. 6. — Si per ipsos ea, quæ sunt super Cælos, facta sunt; dicant nobis, quæ sit invisibilium natura; enarrent numerum Angelorum, & ordinem Archangelorum; demonstrent Thronorum Sacramenta, & doceant diversitates Dominationum, Principatuum & Potestatum atque Virtutum.

Item. iii. 25. 3. Sapientiâ igitur præcellet Pater super omnem *humanam* & *Angelicam Sapiëntiam*.

“ The

“ The Creation, saith he, is not in his power; since he is one of the Creatures himself. ^m ”

Other more special Maxims shall be produced in their proper places.

C H A P. II.

Passages relating to the two distinct Natures, the Divine and Human, united in the Person of Christ.

I. **O**UR Saviour was not a mere Man, but as begotten of the Father, had a glorious Divine Nature, præ-existent to his Incarnation.

“ — The Word of God, who is the Saviour
“ of all, and Ruler of Heaven and Earth, —
“ who also assumed Flesh, and was anointed
“ with the Spirit by the Father, became Jesus
“ Christ. — For as the Word of God was Man,
“ of the Root of *Jesse*, and the Son of *Abraham*,
“ the Spirit of God rested upon him, and he
“ was anointed to preach Glad-tidings to the

^m v. 22. 2. Illud igitur quod ait : *Hæc omnia mihi tradita sunt, & cui volo, do ea*, ut in superbiam elatus ait. Neque enim conditio sub ejus potestate est : quandoquidem & ipse unus de creaturis est.

^a iii 9. 3. — Verbum Dei, qui est Salvator omnium, & Dominator Cœli & Terræ, — qui & assumpsit Carnem, & unctus est à Patre Spiritu, Jesus Christus factus est. — nam secundum id quod verbum Dei homo erat, ex Radice *Jesse*, & Filius *Abrahæ*, secundum hoc quiescebat Spiritus Dei super eum, & ungebatur ad evangelizandum humilibus. Secundum autem quod Deus erat, non secundum Gloriam (*κατὰ τὴν δόξαν*, secundum opinionem) judicabat, &c.

“ humble.

“ humble. But as he was God, he did not
 “ judge according to Appearance.

“ ^b Having clearly demonstrated, that the
 “ Word, that was in the beginning with God,—
 “ was, at the time appointed by the Father, u-
 “ nited to his own Workmanship, and became
 “ a suffering man, I have left no room for their
 “ contrary Opinion, who say ; *If Christ was*
 “ *then born, he had no being before.* For I have
 “ shewn, the Son of God did not then begin
 “ to exist, but was ever with the Father, &c.

II. The λόγος, or Divine Nature of Christ did assume true and perfect human Nature, consisting of Soul and Body, into a close and ineffable Union with Himself, so as to make but one Christ.—*Irenæus* did not dream of the λόγος its being passible, and supplying the Place of an human Soul in the Man Christ Jesus.

The *Valentinians* divided the Person of Christ, by distinguishing *Christ* from the *Saviour*, and both from Jesus ; they held, that the Superior Nature, which they called *Christ*, was not personally united to the Man Jesus, but only descended on, and dwelt in Him a while, and then return'd to his place above.

To this Error he opposes the Catholic Doctrine of the Union of the two Natures in the same Person of Christ, which he asserts from Scripture by many Arguments ^c.

^b iii. 18. 1. Ostenso manifeste, quod in principio Verbum existens apud Deum,—hunc—secundum præfinitum tempus à Patre, unitum suo plasmati, passibilem hominem factum ; exclusa est omnis contradictio dicentium : si ergo tunc natus est, non erat ergo ante Christus. Ostendimus enim, quia non tunc cœpit Filius Dei, existens semper apud Patrem.—

^c Vide Libri 3ⁱⁱⁱ caput 16^{um} per totum, &c.

C

d “ I. The

1. ^d “ The Son of God became the Son of
 “ Man, that thro’ Him we might receive the
 “ Adoption of Sons, the Man having in him,
 “ and as it were, holding and containing the
 “ Son of God,” (i.e. *The Human Nature was
 like a Tabernacle, or Vessel fill’d with the Indwell-
 ing Deity*;) “ Therefore Mark also saith: *The
 “ beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son
 “ of God, as it is written in the Prophets*, Mar. i. 1.
 “ owning the Son of God Jesus Christ to be
 “ one and the same Person, who was preach’d
 “ by the Prophets, and is *Emmanuel* of the
 “ fruit of *David’s* body.” —

Here he strongly expresses and proves, that
 Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and the Son of
 Man, was not one, and another, but one and
 the Same Person; He that was of *the Seed of
 David after the Flesh*, was declared to be the very
Son of God, Rom. i. 1, 2, 3, 4. He who came of
the Jews; with respect to the assumed humani-
 ty, was also *God over all, blessed for Ever*, chap.
 ix. 5. The same Person, who was the *Son of
 God* by eternal Generation, was made of a *Wo-
 man* by his birth in time, Gal. iv. 4. For upon
 these Texts he grounds his Doctrine of the U-
 nity of Christ’s Person. Besides, it deserves a
 Remark too, that *Irenæus* supposes all along,
 the Filiation belong’d properly and originally to
 Christ’s Divine Nature, and was founded in
 eternal Generation; he never dreamt, that the

^d iii. 16. 3. — *Filius Dei, hominis filius factus, ut per
 eum adoptionem percipiamus, portante homine, & capiente,
 & complectente Filium Dei. Propter hoc & Marcus ait :
 Initium Evangelii Jesu Christi Filii Dei, quemadmodum Scriptum
 est in Prophetis. Unum & eundem sciens Filium Dei Jesum
 Christum, qui à Prophetis annuntiatus est, qui ex fructu Ven-
 tris David Emmanuel, &c.*

Son of God was a Name of an Office, or Title grounded on his Birth of a Virgin; but uses it in Contra-distinction to his human Nature, by which he was the Son of Man. The Man Christ was the Son of God only by Virtue of a personal Union with the λόγος, who was the Son of God by Nature, *i. e.* by Eternal Generation, and being God of the Same Nature with the Father.

2. ^e “—The only begotten Word of God, who is ever present with Mankind, being intimately united to his own Workmanship, according to the Father’s good Pleasure, and made Flesh, is Jesus Christ our Lord, who suffer’d for us.——

3. ^f “He united Man to God; for if it had not been *Man* that overcame the Enemy of Man, He had not been justly vanquish’d. Again; had it not been God that gave us Salvation, we could never with any certainty have depended upon it. And if Man had not

* iii. 16. 6. —Nescientes, quoniam hujus Verbum Unigenitus, qui semper humano generi adest, unitus & * conspersus suo plasmati secundum placitum Patris, & caro factus, ipse est Jesus Christus Dominus noster, qui passus est pro nobis.——

* Περυρμένως Græcè, quo ferè sensu apud Plutarchum in Romulo, περυσμένη σάματι φύλη, *i. e.* anima Corpori commixta, seu intime unita dicitur. v. Maffuet. Not. in loc.

^f iii. 18. 7. —Ένωσεν αὐν,——τὸ ἄνθρωπον τῷ Θεῷ· εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἄνθρωπος ἐίκησεν τὸ ἀντίπαλον τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, ἔκ ἀν δικάσιαις ἐνίκηθῃ ὁ ἐχθρὸς πάλιν τε, εἰ μὴ ὁ Θεὸς ἐδωρήσατο τὴν σωτηρίαν, ἔκ ἀν βεβαίως ἔχομεν αὐτὴν· καὶ εἰ μὴ συννώθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῷ Θεῷ, ἔκ ἀν ἠδυνήθη μετασχεῖν ἀφθαρσίας· ἴδει γὰρ τὸ μιστήν Θεῷ τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων, διὰ τὴν ἰστίαν πρὸς ἑκατέρω ἀικιότητῃ, εἰς φιλίαν καὶ ὁμόνοιαν τὰς ἀμφοτέρω συναγαγεῖν.

Confer locum plane geminum, cap. seq. 1. — Qui Filius Dei est, filius hominis factus est;——non enim aliter poteramus incorruptelam & immortalitatem, percipere, &c.

“ been united to God, he could never have
 “ been partaker of Immortality: For the Me-
 “ diator between God and Men, must, by be-
 “ ing closely ally’d to both Parties, restore mu-
 “ tual Friendship and Concord betwixt ’em.”

’Tis evident, he here by God means the true God, or one who has the Nature of God; and not a God by Appointment, or by being entrusted with Dominion. For as his Office of Mediator between God and Men, made it necessary he should be true Man, so by a parity of Reason he must likewise have the nature of God. And as he was ally’d to us by Consubstantiality, and the same common Nature, so his Alliance to the other party must also imply Consubstantiality with God. If a subordinate Ruler’s being united to our Nature, had any tendency to make us immortal, then a mere Man, entrusted with such Divine Dominion, might be qualify’d to be our Mediator, and the Author of Eternal Salvation; which saps the very Foundation of his Argument.

4. § “ That we consist of a Body taken from
 “ the Earth, and a Soul receiving the Spirit
 “ from God, no Body will deny: Therefore
 “ the Son of God became *the Same*,” (*assum’d a
 Soul and Body*) “ summing up his own Work-
 “ manship in Himself; and upon that account
 “ owns himself to be the Son of Man.”

He proceeds to prove there the Truth of his human Nature from the Sufferings of his Body,

§ iii. 22. 1. Nos autem quoniam corpus sumus de terrâ acceptum, & anima accipiens à Deo Spiritum, omnis quicunque confitebitur. Hoc itaque factum est Verbum Dei, suum plasma in semetipsum recapitulans: & propter hoc filium hominis se confitetur.——v. quæ sequuntur.

and

and Sorrows of his Soul. His Reasonings are resolved into this Principle, *That He had not been true Man, without assuming both the Constituents of a Man, the Body and Soul.* Compare with this what he elſewhere ſays.

^h “—Man is made after the Likeneſs of God,
 “ and not a part of Man: the Soul and Spirit
 “ may be a part of the Man, but not the Man
 “ himſelf: a compleat Man is a Composition
 “ and Union of a Soul receiving the Spirit of
 “ the Father, and of that Fleſh joined with it,
 “ which was made after the Image of God.

Again: ⁱ “ The fleſhly Frame is not by it
 “ ſelf a perfect Man; but the body and part of
 “ a Man: nor is the Soul in it ſelf a Man; but
 “ the Soul, and a part of the Man: nor is the
 “ Spirit a Man; for ’tis called the Spirit, and
 “ not a Man. But all theſe put together, and
 “ united, make a compleat Man.

^j ^k “ The Prophets, who ſet him forth as
 “ *Emmanuel* to be born of the Virgin, ſigni-
 “ fy’d the union of the Word of God with his

^h v. 6. 1. —Fit homo ſecundum ſimilitudinem Dei, ſed non pars hominis. Anima autem & Spiritus pars hominis eſſe poſſunt, homo autem nequaquam. Perfectus autem homo commixtio & adunitio eſt animæ aſſumentis Spiritum Patris, & admixta ei carni, quæ eſt plasmata ſecundum Imaginem Dei.

ⁱ Et poſt pauca. Neque enim plasmatio carnis ipſa ſecundum ſe homo perfectus eſt; ſed corpus hominis, & pars hominis. Neque enim & anima ipſa ſecundum ſe homo; ſed anima hominis, & pars hominis. Neque Spiritus homo; Spiritus enim, & non homo vocatur. Commixtio autem & unitio horum omnium, perfectum hominem efficit.

^k iv. 33. 11. Et qui cum ex Virgine Emmanuel prædicabant, adunionem verbi Dei ad plasma ejus manifeſtabant: quoniam Verbum caro erit, & Filius Dei Filius hominis;—& hoc factus, quod & nos, Deus fortis eſt, & incenarrabile habet genus.

“ own Workmanship, that the Word should
 “ be made Flesh, and the Son of God the Son of
 “ Man;—and that being made of the Same
 “ Nature with us, *He is the mighty God, Isa. ix.*
 “ 6. and has *an ineffable Generation*, chap. liii. 8.
 6. ^l “ Remember, that you are redeemed by
 “ the Flesh and Blood of our Lord, and *hold-*
 “ *ing the Head, from which the whole Body of*
 “ *the Church, being knit together, increaseth*, [Col.
 “ ii. 19.] that is, the Son of God’s coming in
 “ the Flesh, both confessing Him to be God,
 “ and firmly believing his human Nature,—&c.
 7. ^m “ The Lord by the Law confuted Sa-
 “ tan, saying : *It is written again, thou shalt not*
 “ *tempt the Lord thy God.* Shewing, by that
 “ saying taken out of the Law, his own hu-
 “ man Nature, that being Man he should not
 “ tempt God ; but as it concern’d him (Satan,)
 “ that he should not tempt the Lord his God,
 “ in that Man that was visible :” *i. e.* God ma-
 nifested in Christ’s human Nature.

I cannot see, that, tho’ this Passage is some-
 what obscure, it is fairly capable of any other
 sense. Τὸ κατ’ ἀνθρώπον, must be opposed to
 Christ’s Divine Nature, and consequently signify
 his Manhood, which was under the Law. And
 then he observes, that the Reason and Equity

^l v. 14. 4. Memor igitur, Dilectissime, quoniam Carne
 Domini nostri redemptus es, & sanguine ejus redhibitus, &
tenens Caput, ex quo universum Corpus Ecclesie compaginatum
augetur, hoc est, Carnalem Adventum Filii Dei, & Deum
 confitens, & hominem ejus firmiter excipiens, &c.

^m v. 21. 2. Dominus itaque legitimè confutavit eum, di-
 cens: *Item scriptum est, non tentabis Dominum Deum tuum*;
 per eam vocem, quæ est in Lege, ostendens, id quidem quod
 est secundum hominem, quoniam non debet homo tentare
 Deum; quantum autem ad illum, quoniam in eo homine qui
 videbatur, non tentaret (al. tentare) Dominum Deum suum.

of

of that prohibition extended to the Devil also, tho' not a Man; and that he should not tempt his Lord, even appearing in the Nature of Man. An apostate and fugitive Servant ought not to lift up his Hand against his Master and Sovereign; for he afterwards says, the Word did overcome, and bind him, as his own Fugitive, or Run-away Servantⁿ.

° 8. " As the light Wood sunk under Water, and the heavy Iron swam, 2 *Kings* vi. 6. " so God the Word being united to Flesh by " a physical and hypostatical Union, the heavy " and earthly Nature was lifted up to Heaven " by the Divine Nature."

Tho' this Passage is only taken out of a *Greek Catena* on the *Books of Kings*, found in the *French King's Library*; yet he that will be at the trouble to compare it with some Passages in *Irenæus* not unlike it^p, will see little Reason to doubt of its Genuineness.

ⁿ v. 21. §. 3. — Fugitivum eum homo ejus, & * Legis Transgressorem, & Apostatam Dei ostendens, postea jam Verbum constanter eum colligavit, quasi suum Fugitivum. —

* Legis Transgressorem ostendit Satanam Dominus, quod Dominum Deum suum in Carne conspicuum tentare ausus esset: nam illud huc referendum puto.

° Fragm. 1. p. 347. Ed. B. — 'Ως ᾧ τὸ κρυφώτατον ξύλον ὑποβρύχιον γέγονεν, ὃ ὅ βαρύτερα ἐπεπλόαζε σίδηρος ἔτω τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος, ἐνάσει, τῇ καθ' ὑπόστασιν φυσικῇ, ἐνωθέντῃ τῇ σαρκὶ τὸ βαρὺ καὶ γεῶδες ὑπὸ τῆς θείας φύσεως εἰς ἑρανὸς ἀνελήφθη.

^p Confer l. 5. c. 17. 4. necnon l. 4. c. 34. 4.

C H A P. III.

The Passages, wherein the Father, Son and Spirit are mention'd.

I. ^a “ **T**HE Church, tho’ it be dispersed
 “ over all the World unto the ends
 “ of the Earth, received from the Apostles and
 “ their Disciples, the Faith in one God, the Fa-
 “ ther Almighty, the Maker of Heaven, and
 “ Earth, and Sea, and all things in them : And in
 “ one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who was in-
 “ carnate for our Salvation : And in the Holy
 “ Ghost, who by the Prophets foretold the
 “ Dispensations of God, and the Advents, and
 “ the Birth of a Virgin, and the Passion, and
 “ the Resurrection from the Dead, and the bo-
 “ dily Ascension to Heaven, of the beloved
 “ Christ Jesus our Lord.—

2. ^b “ We hold the Rule of Truth, which
 “ is, that there is one God Almighty, who
 “ made

^a i. 10. 1. Ἡ μὲν ᾧ ἐκκλησία, καίπερ καθ’ ὅλης τ’ οἰκουμένης, πῶς περάτων τ’ γῆς διεσπαρμένη, παρὰ ᾧ τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν ἐκείνων μαθητῶν παραλαβοῦσα τὴν εἰς ἓνα Θεόν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πεποιηκότα τὸ ἔρανον, καὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τὰς θαλάσσας, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, πῖσιν· καὶ εἰς ἓνα Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν σαρκωθέντα ὑπὲρ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν· καὶ εἰς πνεῦμα ἅγιον, τὸ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν κεκρυχὸς τὰς οἰκονομίας, καὶ τὰς ἐλεύσεις, καὶ τὴν ἐκ πατρὸς γενέσθαι, καὶ τὸ πάθος, καὶ τὴν ἔγερσιν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ τὴν ἔσχατον εἰς τοὺς οὐρανὸς ἀνάληψιν τοῦ ἡγαπημένου Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

^b i. 22. 1. Cum teneamus autem nos Regulam Veritatis, id est, quia fit unus Deus omnipotens, qui omnia condidit per Verbum suum, & aptavit, & fecit ex eo quod non erat, ad hoc ut sint omnia, quemadmodum Scriptura dicit : *Verbo enim Domini Caeli firmati sunt, & Spiritu oris ejus omnis virtus eorum.*

“ made—all things out of nothing by his Word ;
 “ as the Scripture saith : *By the Word of the*
 “ *Lord were the Heavens established ; and by the*
 “ *Spirit of his Mouth all their Hosts*, Psal. xxxiii.
 “ 6. And again : *All things were made by him ;*
 “ *and without him was nothing made*, Joh. i. 3.
 “ (now from *all things* nothing is excepted)
 “ but the Father made *all things* by him, whe-
 “ ther visible or invisible—and not by An-
 “ gels, nor by any Powers separated from his
 “ own Mind: for the God of all stands in need
 “ of nothing: but by his own Word and Spi-
 “ rit makes, and orders and governs, and gives
 “ being to all things. He that made the
 “ World,—and formed Man, he is the God
 “ of *Abraham*, and the God of *Isaac*, and the
 “ God of *Jacob*, above whom there is no other
 “ God, nor Principality, nor Power, nor Ple-
 “ nitude: This is the Father of our Lord Jesus
 “ Christ.—

3. “ (The Creator) himself freely and by
 “ his own Power made, disposed, and finish’d
 “ all things of himself ;—He alone is found to
 “ be God, who made all things, the alone Om-
 “ nipotent,

eorum. Et iterum : Omnia per ipsum facta sunt, & sine ipso factum est nihil. (Ex omnibus autem nihil subtractum est ; sed omnia per ipsum fecit Pater, sive visibilia, sive invisibilia—) non per Angelos, neque per Virtutes aliquas abscissas ab ejus sententiâ ; nihil enim indiget omnium Deus : sed & per Verbum & Spiritum suum omnia faciens, & disponens, & gubernans, & omnibus esse præstans : hic qui mundum fecit,—hic qui hominem plasmavit, hic Deus Abraham, & Deus Isaac, & Deus Jacob, super quem alius Deus non est, neque Initium, neque Virtus, neque Pleroma, hic pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi.

“ ii. 30. 9. —Ipse (sc. *Demiurgus*) à semetipso fecit liberè & ex suâ potestate, & disposuit, & perfecit omnia ;—
 Solus hic Deus invenitur, qui omnia fecit, solus omnipotens,

D

& solus

“ nipotent, and the alone Father creating all
 “ things visible and invisible— *by the Word*
 “ *of his Power*: And he adjusted and disposed
 “ all *by his Wisdom*; and tho’ comprehending
 “ all things, himself alone can be comprehend-
 “ ed by none: Himself is the Creator, Author
 “ and Lord of all things: And there is none
 “ besides him, or above him, not that Mo-
 “ ther, which they falsely imagine, nor *Mar-*
 “ *cion’s* other God, nor any Plerôma of thirty
 “ *Æons*,—nor a *Bythus*, nor *Proarche*,—
 “ nor any one of the monstrous Inventions of
 “ these, and of all Heretics. But the one God
 “ the Creator alone, he is above all Principa-
 “ lity and Power, and Dominion, and Might:
 “ This is the Father, this is God, this is the
 “ Creator and Maker, who *by himself*, that is,
 “ *by his own Word and Spirit*, made Heaven,
 “ and Earth, and Seas, and all things that are
 “ in ’em: He is just, he is good: This is he
 “ that formed Man, that planted Paradise, that
 “ framed the World, that sent the Deluge,
 “ that

& solus Pater condens & faciens omnia, & visibilia, & invisibilia. — *Verbo Virtutis suæ*: Et omnia aptavit, & disposuit Sapientiam suam, & omnia capiens, solus autem a nemine capi potest: ipse fabricator, ipse conditor, ipse inventor, ipse factor, ipse Dominus omnium: & neque præter ipsum, neque super ipsum, neque Mater, quam illi admentuntur; nec Deus alter, quem Marcion affinxit; nec Pleroma 30 Æonum, quod vanum ostensum est; neque Bythus, nec Proarche; — nec in totum quidquam eorum, quæ ab his, & ab omnibus Hæreticis delirantur. Sed solus unus Deus Fabricator, hic qui est super omnem Principalitatem, & Potestatem, & Dominationem, & Virtutem: hic Pater, hic Deus, hic conditor, hic factor, hic fabricator, qui fecit ea per semetipsum, hoc est, per Verbum, & per Sapientiam suam, Cælum, & Terram, & Maria, & omnia quæ in eis sunt: hic justus, hic bonus: hic est qui formavit hominem, qui plantavit Paradisum, qui fabricavit mundum, qui Diluvium induxit, qui Noë salvavit: hic
 Deus

“ that sated *Noe* : This is the God of *Abraham*, and the God of *Isaac*, and the God of *Jacob*, the God of the living, whom the Law shews forth, and the Prophets declare, whom Christ reveals, and the Apostles preach, and the Church believes in. This Father of our Lord Jesus is revealed and made known to all, that have any Discovery of him, by his own Word, who is his Son.”——

I have set down these important Passages almost entire, tho’ several things in ’em will with more Propriety come under Consideration hereafter. The Reader may please to observe concerning ’em, a few Particulars.

1. That the Truths contained in ’em are deliver’d as the known and avowed Doctrine of the whole Catholic Church, received from the Apostles and their immediate Disciples, and carefully preserved in the Primitive Creeds.

2. There are three Persons, in whom they believed, *the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit* : the two latter often called the *Word* and the *Wisdom* of God : And the Doctrine of this glorious Trinity was, it seems, the Summary and Groundwork of all that Christians believ’d.

3. ’Tis as plain almost as Words can make it, that when the *one God, the only Omnipotent and Creator of all, besides whom there is no God*, is said to be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, ’tis not to exclude the Son and Holy Ghost, but the imaginary Deities of the *Valentinians*, and other Heretics. For clearing this, it must

Deus Abraham, & Deus Isaac, & Deus Jacob, Deus vivorum, quem & Lex annuntiat, quem Prophetæ præconant, quem Christus revelat, quem Apostoli tradunt, quem Ecclesia credit. Hic Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, per Verbum suum, qui est Filius ejus, per eum revelatur & manifestatur omnibus, quibus revelatur.

be observed, that our Author's professed Design was to confute the wild Schemes of the several Sects of the *Gnostic* Heretics, of whom the *Valentinians* were the chief. They taught, that the *Demiurgus*, or Creator of the World, was not the supream God, but far inferior to him. Their supream God and Father of all they called *Bythus*, i. e. *the Depth, or incomprehensible Being*, &c. him they supposed to have silently enjoy'd himself from all Eternity; and at last, long before the beginning of the World, to have produced a glorious *Æon*, equal to himself, and capable to comprehend him: whom they called the *only-begotten* (*Monogenes*) and *the Mind*, (*Nus*) they coupled him with another Female-*Æon* emitted at the same time, termed (*Alethia*) *Truth*. These soon propagated another brace of *Æons*, called *Logos* and *Zoë*, *the Word and the Life*; and so others proceeded from them, till the Number of thirty was filled up, all contained in one *Plerôma*, or Plenitude. The last Female-*Æon*, called *Sophia*, *Wisdom*, thro' an immoderate Desire to search out, and comprehend the unknown Father, had almost lost her Place in the *Plerôma* of the *Æons*: And tho' recover'd after some time, yet produced a monstrous Birth, called Mother *Achamoth*; a blind, shapeless *Æon*, made up of Ignorance and Passion, cast forth without the *Plerôma*, and yet under some Influence and Management of those within it: She produced the *Demiurgus*, or the Creator, who made the World. Others had Schemes different from this: Some held the World was created by seven Angels, the first of whom was the Patron of the *Jews*, and Author of the Law. *Marcion* held two Gods, a supream, that sent Christ, who

who alone was good ; and a subordinate, who made the World, and gave the Law ; him he supposed to be just without Goodness. However, they generally agreed, that the Creator and God of the Old Testament, was not the supream Father that Christ came to reveal ; whom they supposed to be unknown before.

Now considering, that 'tis this heap of Blasphemy and monstrous Opinions, and not the Doctrine of the Trinity that *Irenæus* is disproving, to take his Words, curtailed and mangled, and, by clapping 'em in after an *Arian* Proposition, to set 'em in such a Light, that the Reader must understand 'em to have been leveled against the Divinity of the Son and Spirit, will not, I think, bear so much as an Appearance of Ingenuity and fair Dealing^d. Let the Reader, that would not be imposed upon, carry his scope in his Thoughts, and take a view of his Expressions in their native Simplicity, and try whether they will bear the *Arian* Sense. When he so strongly asserts, there is but *one only God*, he expresses the known Doctrine of the Church, in Opposition not only to more supream Gods, but to one supream, and others subordinate ; which Tenet is common to the *Arians* with all the Heretics he opposes : hence he asserts, there is *no God*, not only *above him*, but *besides him*. When he had proved, that the Creator of the World is the one God, he adds, *This is the Father of Christ*, in Opposition to their Opinion, who held, that the God revealed by Christ, and the Maker of Heaven and Earth, were two different Beings.—When he says of the one God,

^d See Dr. *Clarke's* Scripture-Doctrine, p. 212, 213, 214, 215. Ed. 2.

that

that *there is no God above him*, his professed Scope directs us to understand him simply to deny their Scheme, who set many Gods above the Creator, and not to insinuate any Distinction between him, and a subordinate God, or Gods, that have another God above them: for this is really the heretical Scheme opposed by him, and utterly inconsistent with Christian Principles. But that the impartial may judge, whether the Son and Spirit are here struck off by the exclusive Terms, or all along taken in with the Father, as supposed to be inseparably united to him, according to Christian Doctrine, I shall give a brief view of the Evidence in the Margin^e.

But

* Characters of the one only God here set down.

1. He is the Creator of all things.

2. He has his Word and Wisdom in, and with himself, which cannot be supposed to be Beings distinct from him in Nature, or to be separately consider'd.

3. He is incomprehensible to all others.

4. He is the God of *Abraham*, &c. the God of the living.

5. He planted Paradise, caused the Flood, saved *Noë*, &c.

The Son and Spirit are included in the one only God.

1. This Character belongs to the Son and Spirit, which were not inferior Agents in this Work, as shall be shewn.

2. The Son and Spirit are termed his Word and Wisdom, to express their ineffable Union with Him, in opposition to separate Powers and all subordinate Agents, and not to make 'em mere Attributes.

3. But the Son comprehends him, as shall be shewn; and therefore is not opposed to him, but included in him here.

4. Christ himself with the Father is the God of the living, &c. iv. 5. 2.

5. All these, and the like are often ascribed personally to the Son.

6. He

But *Irenæus* sufficiently explains himself, and expressly shews whom he intended to exclude by these Terms: — “There is no other God, saith he, either besides him, or above him; not *Achamoth*, nor *Marcion’s* other God, nor the thirty *Æons*, nor the *Bythus*, &c. But the one God the Creator alone.” — The Argument grounded on the exclusive Terms shall be fully consider’d in a proper Place: I would only observe at present, that, as they are sometimes taken *respectively*, not excluding all absolutely, but only those that the Author’s Scope led him to exclude; as *Irenæus* prefaces the third Passage set down above, with such an Assertion, *quod & solum verum est, And this only is the Truth*: i. e. This is the Truth, and not the contrary Doctrine, or any other Opinion not consistent with it: So our Author cannot be supposed to exclude from the Godhead the Son and Spirit, that are, in his strong Expression of the Unity, the *Father himself*.

4. When all things are said to be created by the Son and Spirit, the Divine Work of the Creation is not ascribed to Creatures, Instruments, or inferior Agents; for he distinguishes them from the Angels, and all separate Powers, distinct from the one God; and looks upon it as inconsistent with the Divine Self-sufficiency, to employ any Agents in this glorious Work, not of the same

6. He is supposed to be uncreated.

7. He made all things *alone*, and by *himself*.

8. He is above all Principality, &c.

6. So is the Son, “for *all things were made by him*; and *all* here admits no Exception, as *Irenæus* expressly observes.

7. The Son and Spirit then are not excluded, but reckon’d one with himself.

8. So is the Son, *Eph. i.*
21.

Nature,

Nature, and one with himself; as hereafter shall be more fully shewn ^f.

§. Tho' there are three Divine Persons, yet they make not so many Gods; for the Son and Spirit are not considered as created Beings, or Powers distinct from the one God, but included in him, and so closely united to the Father, that they may be called *himself*:— *By himself, saith he*, i. e. *by his Word and Spirit he made Heaven and Earth, &c.* And this way of working shew'd his Self-sufficiency, that he needed not the Co-operation or Instrumentality of any Being besides himself. How could he more plainly intimate, that the Son and Spirit are one God with the Father? To do any thing, *δι' αὐτοῦ*, *by himself*, is a Greek Phrase, opposed to the Agency of others; and plainly here, and in the Passage to be next produced, was intended to exclude the Agency of Angels, or any subordinate Powers, that are not *God himself*. Now according to the *Arian* Scheme, *Irenæus* his Expression would be a glaring Contradiction; and he should have said, *God created the World, not by himself, but by his Word and Spirit*. If any orthodox Father, descanting on the Apostle's Words, *Heb. i. 3.* had said, *Christ did not redeem us by Proxy, or by the Blood of Calves and Goats, but by himself*, i. e. *by his human Soul and Body*. Every body would understand, that he supposed the Soul and Body, in which our Saviour suffered, were so ineffably united to his Divine Nature, that both made but one Christ: or if one should say, *A Man did any thing by himself*, i. e. *with his own Hands*, it would necessarily imply, that his Hands were not accounted fo-

^f See chap. 8.

reign Instruments or Assistants, but Parts of the Man himself. So our Author's Expression must signify the ineffable Union of the Father, Son, and Spirit in the same Nature and Godhead; for these Three are one God; so that the Father's working by the Word and Spirit, was not going out of himself to make use of foreign Aid, or Agency, but exerting himself in his natural way, by those that are one with him by an ineffable Communion in the same Godhead. And he seems manifestly to refer to several Passages of Scripture, in which Creation is ascribed to God alone, exclusive of all others; as *Job ix. 8. which alone spreadeth out the Heavens, &c.* but especially *Isa. xlv. 24. — I am the Lord that maketh all things, that spreadeth forth the Heavens alone, that spreadeth abroad the Earth BY MYSELF.* To create by *himself*, was to do it *alone*: and yet this does not exclude, but take in the Word and Spirit, who are not inferior Agents, but God himself. And as *Irenæus's* Comment on these Words was grounded on the Christian Doctrine, so it was agreeable to the traditional Explication of the *Jews*; for the *Chaldee Paraphrast* gives the Sense of that Text thus:—*“I am the Lord the Maker of all things, I stretched out the Heavens by my Word; I founded the Earth by my Power.* The next Passage will farther illustrate and confirm this.

4. — ^h “ We learn, that God is so great,
 “ and that 'tis he that by himself created, —
 “ adorned,

אֲנִי עֹשֶׂה כָּל־כֹּל בְּיָדִי
 שְׂכַל־לִית אֶרֶץ בְּגִבּוֹרָתִי :

^h iv. 20. i. — Discimus, quoniam est tantus Deus, & ipse est qui *per semetipsum* constituit, — & adornavit, & continet

“ adorned, and upholds all things.—The An-
 “ gels did not form us; nor could the Angels
 “ themselves make the Image of God, nor any
 “ other but the Word of the Lord, nor any
 “ Power far remov’d from the Father of all.
 “ For God needed none of them, to make what
 “ he had determin’d with himself, since he had
 “ his own Hands. For he has ever with him
 “ his Word and Wisdom, his Son and Spirit,
 “ by whom, and in whom he voluntarily and
 “ freely made all things; and to whom he ad-
 “ dress’d himself, saying, *Let us make Man af-*
 “ *ter our Image and Likeness*; taking from him-
 “ self the Substance of the Creatures, the Mo-
 “ del of the Works, and the Figure of the Or-
 “ naments of the World.”

Here he seems to ascribe the Creation of the
 Matter or Substance of the Universe to God
 the Father, the Ideas and Patterns of Things
 to the Son, and the adorning and finishing Part
 to the Spirit; and observes, he was not be-
 holden to others for any of these, but had ’em
 all in, and of himself: which excludes the A-
 gency of inferior Powers, and confirms the U-
 nity of the blessed Three, who are no other
 than *God himself*.

Dr. *Clarke* saw there was need of Artifice to

tinet omnia. — Non ergo Angeli fecerunt nos, nec nos
 plasnaverunt, nec Angeli potuerunt imaginem facere Dei;
 nec alijs quis præter verbum Domini, nec virtus longè ab-
 sistens à Patre universorum. Nec enim indigebat horum Deus,
 ad faciendum quæ ipse apud se prædefinierat fieri, quasi ipse
 suas non haberet manus. Adest enim ei semper Verbum &
 Sapientia, Filius & Spiritus, per quos, & in quibus omnia li-
 berè & spontè fecit, ad quos & loquitur, dicens: faciamus
 hominem ad imaginem & similitudinem nostram; ipse à *se-*
metipso substantiam creaturarum, & exemplum factorum, &
 figuram in mundo ornamentorum accipiens.

evade

evade the force of this strong and plain Expression, viz. *God's making all things by himself*; which according to his Scheme, must mean, that God did not do this Work *by himself*, but by two subordinate Powers that execute his Will. To bring it to this Sense, which is the Contradiction of it, he produces the other Expression, viz. *His doing this Work with his own Hands, that is, his Word and Spirit*; and supposeth this was intended to be explicatory of the other, and to mean no more, than that they (as subordinate Agents) *exercise the Power, and execute the Will of God, as a Man's own Hands execute his Power and Will*ⁱ. Whereas, in good Sense, the latter Expression, as figurative and more general, should be explain'd by the former; which is proper and of a more determinate Signification; as always the more specific Declarations explain and determine the Sense of more loose and general ones. Besides, the Doctor strips the latter Expression of its Emphasis, and puts an insipid Sense upon it, in order not to explain, but really destroy the former, and advance the contradictory of it.

But let *Ireneus* be explained by his own Words in their intended Sense and Emphasis, and by his Argument and Scope, and not by *Arian* Principles, that he never heard of; and he'll speak consistently. His professed Scope in this and other Places, is to confute their heretical Schemes, who held, the World was made by subordinate Powers, and not by the supream God: and tho' they supposed also, this Work was done without the Command of the Father of all, yet 'tis not this part of their Scheme he

ⁱ Scripture Doctrine, p. 282, 283. Ed. 2.

here opposes; else he would have said, *God did not authorize or command these supposed Creators*, and shew'd, that without his Pleasure nothing could be created: But he says, *God did not need 'em to execute his Will*, arguing against the Agency of all inferior Powers from the Self-sufficiency of God, who has all the requisites to Creation in, and of himself. The Argument and Scope of the Place, the necessary import of his Expression, *creating by himself*, compar'd with the Scriptures plainly refer'd to, which assert his making all things *alone*, all these unavoidably exclude all subordinate Agents, or created Instruments, and imply, or rather fully express God's applying himself immediately to this glorious Work. And consequently, he intended a special Emphasis in his favourite Simile of the Father's *creating with his own two Hands*, that is, the Son and Spirit: as when a Master does not sit still, and use the Ministry of his Servants, but does his Work himself, he is said to do it *with his own Hands*. $\Delta\iota\ \epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, and $\iota\delta\iota\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\iota\nu\ \epsilon\gamma\gamma\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota\delta\alpha\iota$ are equivalent Phrases in Greek, and both signify $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\gamma\gamma\iota\alpha\nu$, i. e. *doing any thing immediately, without the Agency of others*. And thus indeed the two Expressions mutually explain one another, and are grounded on Texts of Scripture of the same import: as *Isa. xlv. 12. I, even my Hands have stretched out the Heavens*. And *chap. xlviii. 13. Mine Hand hath laid the Foundation of the Earth, and my Right-hand hath spanned the Heavens*. These Texts carry the same meaning in them with the former, that assert God's creating all things *alone and by himself*, and are render'd alike by the ancient Chaldee Paraphrast, viz. that God made Heaven and Earth *by his Word and Power*. The ancient Jews, who disowned

disowned all inferior Gods and Creators, understood by the Hands of God his two glorious Powers, which are no other but the Word and Spirit of God^k. And 'tis as plain from Scripture that his Hands are not different from himself.

§. ¹ “ Our Lord, after his Incarnation, received Power over all things from the Father, who made by his Word, and by his Wisdom adorned all things.”

This Power that Christ received from the Father, was not supposed by *Irenæus* to be his original, Divine Dominion; nor was his Father's Donation the only Foundation of his Title to sovereign Authority: for he asserts him to have been Lord of the whole Creation before his Incarnation, and as he had the same Divine Power jointly with the Father, so he had the same Title to it, which was founded in Creation. This he fully expresses elsewhere, grounding this Doctrine on the Scripture, *Joh. i. 10, 11.* ^m *He was in the World, and the World was made by him: — He came unto his own* ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ,

^k See Dr. *Alix's* Judgment of the *Jewish* Church against the *Unitarians*.

¹ iv. 20. 2. — Ab eodem, qui omnia Verbo fecit, & Sapientiâ adornavit, accipiens omnium potestatem, quando Verbum caro factum est.

^m v. 18. 2. Deinde de ipso Verbo dixit: In hoc mundo erat, & mundus per ipsum factus est. — In sua propria venit, & sui cum non receperunt. — Manifestè ostendens, — quoniam unus Deus Pater super omnes, & unum Verbum Dei quod per omnes, per quem omnia facta sunt: & quoniam hic mundus proprius ipsius, & per ipsum factus est voluntate Patris, & non per Angelos; neque per Apostasiam, &c.

Et N^o 3. Mundi enim factor verè Verbum Dei est: hic autem est Dominus noster, qui — secundum invisibilitatem continet, quæ facta sunt, omnia, & in universa conditione infixus, quoniam Verbum Dei gubernans & disponens omnia; & propter hoc in sua ---- venit, &c.

into

into his own World, where he had right to sovereign Dominion, as a Man has in his own House) *and his own receiv'd him not.* — “ This shews, saith he, that there is one God the Father over all, and one Word of God, that is thro' all, by whom all things were made : and that this World is his own, and was made by him by the Will of the Father, and not by Angels (supposed to do it without his Consent or Command) nor by Apostasy, &c.”

— And a little lower : “ The Word of God is truly the Maker of the World : now this is our Lord, who—after an invisible manner upholds all things that were made, and fills and pervades the whole Creation, because he is the Word of God governing and disposing all things ; and therefore he came into his own World.” And even in the place under Consideration, he gives a plain Hint of Christ's original Dominion, that, as the Word of God, and Creator of the World, he had antecedently to his Incarnation and the Father's Donation, and also distinguishes from it his mediatorial Power derived by a new Grant from the Father ; for it was given him as a *righteous Man*ⁿ. As God by rescuing *Israel* from *Egyptian* Bondage acquired a new Title to be the Lord their God, without derogating from his essential and original Right to the Allegiance of all his Creatures.

Besides, it should be observed, that *Ireneus*,

ⁿ Accipiens omnium potestatem, quando Verbum caro factum est, ut quemadmodum in Cœlis principatum habuit Verbum Dei, sic & in terrâ haberet Principatum, quoniam Homo justus, *qui peccatum non fecit.*—principatum autem habeat eorum quæ sunt sub terra, ipse primogenitus mortuorum factus.

in inculcating this Derivation of Power to the Mediator, had no thought of degrading him; or leading us to the origin of all his Power and Divine Dominion, as the *Arians* would have it believ'd without Proof: But by the Scripture-Doctrine of the Saviour's being appointed Lord of the whole Creation by the Father, he confutes the Heretics, who held, that the Father of Christ had no Title to Sovereignty in this World by Creation: his Argument runs thus; Christ (as Man and Mediator) received Power over the whole Creation from his own Father: now, how could he deliver to him a World that was not his own? Would the infinitely just and good be liberal of what he had no right to; and send his Son as an Usurper into the Workmanship and Possession of another^o? He concludes therefore, this World must be God's by Creation.

6. P “ Man is made up of Soul and Fleſh,
 “ formed after the likenefs of God, and faſhi-
 “ oned *by his Hands*, that is, by the Son and
 “ Spirit, to whom he ſaid; *Let us make Man*,
 “ *Gen. i. 26.*

7. 9 “ Tho' we cannot find Solutions of all
 “ the Difficulties of Scripture, yet we muſt not
 “ ſee¹

^o Ibid. *Omnia mihi, inquit, tradita ſunt à Patre meo; m*
 niſeſtè ab eo, qui omnia fecit: non enim aliena, ſed ſu-
 tradidit ei.

Confer. v. 2. 1. Vani autem & qui in aliena dicunt Deum
 veniſſe, velut aliena concupiſcentem, uti eum hominem,
 qui ab altero factus eſſet, exhiberet ei Deo, qui neque fe-
 ciſſet, neque condidiſſet, &c.

P iv. Præf. 4. Homo eſt autem temperatio animæ & car-
 nis, qui ſecundum ſimilitudinem Dei formatus eſt, & per
 manus ejus plasmatus eſt, hoc eſt, per Filium & Spiritum;
 quibus & dixit: *Faciamus hominem.*

1 ii. 28. 2. Si autem omnium, quæ in Scripturis requi-
 runtur,

“ seek for another God, besides the true one; —
 “ but leave such things to the God that made
 “ us; being well assured, that the Scriptures
 “ are perfect, as being endited by the Word
 “ and Spirit of God.

8. ^r “ In the name of Christ, he that anoint-
 “ ed, he that was anointed, and the Unction it
 “ self, with which he was anointed, are under-
 “ stood. Now it was the Father that anointed
 “ him, and the Son was anointed with the Spi-
 “ rit, who is the Unction: wherefore the Word
 “ saith by *Isaiab*; *The Spirit of God is upon me,*
 “ *because he hath anointed me*; signifying the
 “ anointing Father, the anointed Son, and the
 “ Unction, which is the Spirit.

9. ^r “ God is known by Men, not in respect
 “ of his Greatness, or his Substance; — but
 “ only so far as to satisfy 'em, that he who
 “ made 'em — and by his Word establish'd,
 “ and by his Wisdom framed all things, is the
 “ only true God.

10. ^r “ There is in, and thro' all one God
 “ the

runtur, absolutiones non possumus invenire, alterum tamen Deum, præter eum qui est, non requiramus. — Cedere autem hæc talia debemus Deo, qui & nos fecit, rectissime scientes, quia Scripturæ quidem perfectæ sunt, quippe à Verbo Dei & Spiritu ejus dictæ. —

^r iii. 18. 3. In Christi enim nomine subauditur qui unxit, & ipse qui unctus est, & ipsa Unctio, in quâ unctus est. Et unxit quidem Pater, unctus est vero Filius, in Spiritu, qui est Unctio; quemadmodum per *Esaiam* ait Sermo: *Spiritus Dei super me, propter quod unxit me*; significans & ungentem Patrem, & unctum Filium, & Unctionem, qui est Spiritus.

^r iii. 24. 2. In agnitionem autem (venit hominibus Deus) non secundum magnitudinem, nec secundum substantiam; — sed secundum illud, ut sciremus, quoniam qui fecit & plasmavit, — Verbo suo confirmans, & Sapientiâ compingens omnia, hic est qui est solus verus Deus.

^r iv. 6. 7. Et propter hoc in omnibus, & per omnia unus Deus

“ the Father, and one Word, the Son, and one
 “ Spirit, and one Salvation to all that believe
 “ in him.

11. “ “ When that which is perfect is come,
 “ we shall not see another Father, but the same,
 “ that now we long to see;—nor shall we look
 “ for another Christ and Son of God, but him
 “ that was born of the Virgin *Mary*, and suf-
 “ fered, and whom we believe in, and love:—
 “ nor receive any other holy Spirit, but the
 “ same that is with us, and cries, *Abba, Father*.

12. “ “ By all these Methods is God the Fa-
 “ ther manifested, by the Operation of the Spi-
 “ rit, by the Ministry of the Son, and by the
 “ good Pleasure of the Father.

13. “ “ So *Rahab* the Harlot, condemning
 “ herself, because she was an Heathen, and
 “ guilty of all manner of Sins, yet received,
 “ and hid in her House the three Spies,—viz.
 “ the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.”

Irenæus is speaking of the Signification of
 some typical Actions and historical Passages in
 the Old Testament; and supposes, that as *Moses*

Deus Pater, & unum Verbum, Filius, & unus Spiritus, & una
 salus omnibus credentibus in eum.

“ iv. 9. 2. Sicut igitur veniente perfecto, non alterum
 Patrem videbimus, sed hunc, quem nunc videre concupi-
 mus:—neque alium Christum, & Dei Filium expectabimus;
 sed hunc, qui ex Maria Virgine, qui & passus est, in quem
 & credimus, quem & diligimus:—neque alium Spiritum
 Sanctum percipimus, nisi hunc, qui est nobiscum, & qui
 clamat, *Abba, Pater*.

“ iv. 20. 6. Per omnia enim hæc Deus Pater ostenditur,
 Spiritu quidem operante, Filio verò ministrante, Patre vero
 comprobante, Gr. *ἐνδοξεύει* &c.

“ iv. 20. 12. Sic autem & Raab fornicaria, semetipsam
 quidem condemnans, quoniam esset gentilis, omnium pec-
 catorum rea, suscepit autem tres Speculatores,—& apud se
 abscondit, Patrem scilicet & Filium cum Spiritu Sancto.

his marrying an *Ethiopian* Woman, was a Prediction convey'd by *Things* of the future Conversion of the Gentiles ; so *Rahab's* entertaining the Spies, whom by a slip of Memory he supposed to be Three, was a typical Representation of the Sinners of the Gentiles, their receiving the Holy Trinity by obedience to the Gospel.

14. ^y “ The spiritual Man has a sound Faith
“ in one God Almighty, of whom are all things,
“ and a firm Belief in the Son of God, Christ
“ Jesus our Lord, by whom are all things, and
“ the Dispensations, by which the Son of God
“ became Man, and in the Spirit of God, who
“ gives the Knowledge of the Truth, and ex-
“ plains the Dispensations of the Father and the
“ Son.—

Again : ^z “ He owns, that God, and the
“ Word, and the Spirit are ever the same.

15. ^a “ Man is made after the Image and

^y iv. 33. 7. — Πάντα (τῶν
πνευματικῶν) συνεσχηκεν εἰς ἓνα
Θεόν περὶ ἰσχυρότερον, ἐξ ἧς τὰ
πάντα, πῶς ὅλοκληρον καὶ εἰς
τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸ
κύριον ἡμῶν, δι' ἧς τὰ πάντα, καὶ
τὰς διακονίας αὐτοῦ, δι' ὧν
ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ
Θεοῦ, πεισμονὴ βεβαία· καὶ εἰς
τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ.—

Omnia enim ei constant :
& in unum Deum omnipo-
tentem, ex quo omnia, fides
integra ; & in Filium Dei
Christum Jesum Dominum
nostrum, per quem omnia,
& Dispositiones ejus, per quas
homo factus est Filius Dei,
sententia firma, quæ est in
Spiritu Dei, qui præstat ag-
nitionem Veritatis, qui Dis-
positiones Patris & Filii ex-
posuit, &c.

^z N^o 15. — Semper eundem Deum sciens, & semper
eundem Verbum Dei cognoscens ; — & semper eundem
Spiritus Dei cognoscens.—

^a iv. 38. 3. Ὁ γεννητὸς καὶ πεπλασμέν^{ος} ἄνθρωπος κατ' ἐικό-
να καὶ ὁμείωσιν τοῦ ἀγεννήτου γίνεταί Θεός· τῷ μὲν πατρί εὐδοκῶν-
τος καὶ κελευόντος, τοῦ δὲ υἱοῦ πράττοντος καὶ δημιουργοῦντος, τοῦ
δὲ πνεύματος τρεφόντος καὶ ἀνθρ^ων.

“ Like-

“ Likeness of the uncreated God, by the Fa-
 “ ther willing and giving out Orders, by the
 “ Son executing and creating, and by the Spi-
 “ rit nourishing and encreasing.”

See this Passage fully vindicated in the sub-
 joined Dissertation concerning the use of the
 Word, ἀγέννητος :—Man was made in the Like-
 ness, as well as by the Operation of the Son and
 Spirit, to whom the Father said : *Let us make*
Man after our Image.—And are necessarily here
 included in the uncreated God and Creator of
 all.

16. ^b “ As Christ’s two Hands stretched out
 “ on the Cross, signified the People of the *Jews*
 “ and *Gentiles* dispersed unto the ends of the
 “ Earth ; so there was one Head betwixt ’em,
 “ because there is but one God, who is over
 “ all, and thro’ all, and in us all.

And a little after he shews who this one God
 is, in these Words : ^c “ Thus one God the Fa-
 “ ther is manifested, who is over all, and thro’
 “ all, and in all. The Father is over all, and
 “ he is the Head of Christ ; and the Word is
 “ thro’ all, and he is the Head of the Church ;
 “ and the Spirit is in us all, and he is the liv-
 “ ing Water, that the Lord gives to all that
 “ believe on him aright.”——

Here he expressly declares, that in the one

^b v. 17. 4. — Duæ quidem manus, quia & duo populi
 dispersi in fines terræ: unum autem medium Caput, quoniam
 & unus Deus super omnes, & per omnes, & in omnibus
 nobis.

^c Ibid. 18. 2. Et sic unus Deus Pater ostenditur, qui est
 super omnia, & per omnia, & in omnibus, super omnia qui-
 dem Pater, & ipse est Caput Christi: per omnia autem Ver-
 bum, & ipse est Caput Ecclesiæ: in omnibus autem nobis
 Spiritus, & ipse est aqua viva, quam præstat Dominus in se
 rectè credentibus, &c.

God there is a Trinity of Persons; and tho' the Father only is mention'd by the Apostle, *Eph. iv. 6.* yet 'tis not to be understood exclusive of the Son and Spirit, but they are included, as having the same Godhead, and inseparably united with the Father.

From the whole it appears the Doctrine of a Trinity was believed and preached in the Primitive Church, as the great fundamental Article of Christianity, contain'd in all their Creeds, and professed by all their Catechumens, when received into the Communion of the Church by Baptism. And they believed in the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, as three Persons in the same Godhead, and not as God and two Creatures; else they would never have joined 'em together, as of the same Nature and Order: For *Irenæus* censures it as a great Absurdity in the *Valentinians*, that they reckon'd their Propator with the rest, as one of the thirty *Æons*, because they supposed him to be self-existent, and the others produced in time. ^d “ The Father of all, saith he, ought not to be number'd with the other *Æons*: He that was not prolated, ^{but} ~~and~~ self-existent, with those that were prolated, and begotten in time; the incomprehensible with them that are comprehended by him:——For as he is more excellent than the rest, he ought not to be reckon'd

^d ii. 12. 1. Primo quidem de Triacontade eorum sic dicemus.——Primo quidem, quoniam annumerant reliquis *Æonibus* Propatorem. Pater enim omnium enumerari non debet cum reliquâ Emissione: qui non est emissus, cum eâ quæ emissâ est: & innatus, cum eâ quæ nata est: & quem nemo capit, cum ea quæ ab eo capitur, & propter hoc incapabilis.——secundum enim id quod melior, quam reliqui, non debet cum eis annumerari.

“ with them.”—Had it been the constant known Practice of the whole Christian Church to number two Creatures with the infinite God and Father of all, why should the like be imputed to the Heretics, as a great Incongruity?—If the Christian Trinity (τριάς) was a Collection of Beings so different in Nature and Dignity, as the *Arians* say, why should the *Valentinian Triacotas*, or number of thirty be, upon the same account, any Crime?

C H A P. IV.

General Passages relating to Christ's Deity.

I. ^a “ **N**either our Lord, nor the Holy
 “ Ghost, nor the Apostles would
 “ ever positively and absolutely have given any
 “ one the Title of God, unless he were *truly*
 “ *God*; nor stiled any one *Lord*, in their own
 “ Person, but him that is Lord of all, *viz.* God
 “ the Father, and his Son, who received from
 “ the Father Dominion over the whole Crea-
 “ tion.—”

—^b “ But when the Scripture calls them
 “ Gods that are not so, it does not simply and
 “ fully stile 'em so, but with some Restriction,

^{*} iii. 6. 1. Neque igitur Dominus, neque Spiritus Sanctus, neque Apostoli eum, qui non esset Deus, definitivè & absolūtè Deum nominassent aliquando, nisi esset verè Deus: neque Dominum appellassent aliquem ex suâ personâ, nisi qui dominatur omnium, Deum Patrem, & Filium ejus, qui Dominum accepit à Patre suo omnis Conditionis.

^b Ibid. 3. Cum autem eos, qui non sunt Dii, nominat, non in totum,—Scriptura ostendit illos Deos; sed cum aliquo additamento & significatione, per quam ostenduntur non esse Dii.—

“ and

“ and super-added Hint, by which it appears,
 “ that they are not Gods.”

We have here a plain Maxim and Rule of interpreting Scripture, and deciding that great Point, viz. *Who is to be looked upon as true God.* Let us see also how he applies it.

1. ^c “ Since the Father is truly Lord, and
 “ the Son is truly Lord, the Holy Ghost has
 “ justly given them the Title of Lord.

2. Again: ^d “ *Thy Throne, O God, is for e-*
 “ *ver:—Thou lovest Righteousness, and hatest Ini-*
 “ *quity: Therefore God, thy God hath anointed*
 “ *thee,—*Psal. xlv. 6, 7. The Spirit has given
 “ both the Title of God, viz. the Son, that is
 “ anointed, and the Father, who anointed him.
 “ And again: *God stood in the Assembly of the*
 “ *Gods, and in the midst judges the Gods,* Psal.
 “ lxxxi. 1. He speaks of the Father and Son,
 “ and of those that received the Adoption of
 “ Sons; that is, the Church, which is the Sy-
 “ nagogue of God, that God, i. e. the Son ga-
 “ ther’d by himself, (or in his own Person.)
 “ Of whom he says again: *The God of Gods,*
 “ *the Lord hath spoken, &c.*”

He insists on this Argument at large in seve-

^e iii. 1. Verè igitur cum Pater sit Dominus, & Filius verè sit Dominus, meritò Spiritus Sanctus Domini appellatione signavit eos.

^d Ibid. — *Sedes tua, Deus, in aeternum:—Dilexisti Justitiam, & odisti iniquitatem; propterea unxit te Deus, Deus tuus:—* utrosque enim Dei appellatione signavit Spiritus, & eum, qui ungitur, Filium, & eum qui ungit, id est, Patrem. Et iterum: *Deus stetit in Synagoga Deorum, in medio autem Deos discernit.* De Patre, & Filio, & de his qui adoptionem perceperunt, dicit: Hi autem sunt Ecclesia. Hæc enim est Synagoga Dei, quam Deus, hoc est, Filius ipse *per semetipsum* (Δι' εαυτοῦ) collegit. De quo iterum dicit: *Deus Deorum Dominus loquutus est, &c.*

ral Chapters; and shews, that he that is stiled God in Scripture, without any *diminishing Addition* to shew he is not God, but only called so, is God in the proper and primary Sense.

^e “ It has been fully demonstrated, that the
“ Prophets and Apostles never stiled any one
“ God or Lord, but *the true and only God*.

Again: ^f “ It has been plainly shewn, that
“ neither the Prophets, nor the Apostles, nor
“ the Lord Christ ever confessed any one to be
“ Lord or God in their own Person, but him
“ that is primarily (the *Arians* would say, in
“ *the highest Sense*) God and Lord. For the
“ Prophets and Apostles confess the Father and
“ Son, and stile none else either God or Lord,
“ and the Lord himself taught his Disciples on-
“ ly, that the Father is that God and Lord,
“ who is the only God and Governor of all.

Again: ^g “ The Preachers of Truth, and the
“ Apostles of Liberty stiled none other *God or*
“ *Lord*, but the only true God, the Father,
“ and his Word, who has the Pre-eminence in
“ all things.”

^e iii. 8. 1. Manifestè ostensum est, quoniam nunquam neque Prophetæ, neque Apostoli alium Deum nominaverunt, vel Dominum appellaverunt, præter verum & solum Deum.

^f Ibid. 9. 1. Ostenso hoc igitur planè,—neminem alterum Dominum vel Deum, neque Prophetas, neque Apostolos, neque Dominum Christum Confessum esse ex suâ personâ, sed præcipuè Deum & Dominum: Prophetis quidem & Apostolis Patrem & Filium consentientibus, alterum autem neminem, neque Deum nominantibus, neque Dominum consentientibus: & ipso Domino Patrem tantum Deum & Dominum eum, qui solus est Deus & Dominator omnium, tradente Discipulis.—

^g Ibid. 15. 3. —Neminem alium Deum vocaverunt, vel Dominum nominaverunt, qui Veritatis fuerunt prædicatores, & Apostoli libertatis, nisi solum Verum Deum, Patrem & Verbum ejus, qui in omnibus principatum habet.—

Here he proves, that none is absolutely stiled God or Lord in Scripture, but *the only true God, who is* (præcipuè Deus & Dominus) *primarily God and Lord.* And this is not the Father only; but he takes Pains to demonstrate, that the Son too is stiled God and Lord in this primary, undiminished Sense; and so is included in the only true God. This is undeniable Fact, that every one must see, that reads *Irenæus*: And 'tis as plain he intended to prove, that he who is stiled God *absolutely and without Restriction*, must be *supreme God*, i. e. the only true God; for his Scope is, to assert the supreme Deity of the Creator, whom his Adversaries supposed to be only an inferior Power, that had a God above him. And his Rule, by which he proves his Supremacy, as well as proper Godhead, he applies to the Son, as well as the Father. Whereas, had he argu'd upon *Arian* Principles, he would have said, the Father only was God in this Sense; and when the Son is called God, 'tis not absolutely, but with some lessening Addition or Circumstance, that shews he is not God in the highest Sense: For *Arians* treat the Son, as our Author does those that are, no Gods; that is, when he is stiled God in sacred Writ, they labour to shew there is something added to qualify the Sense of the Word, and bring it down to that low Acceptation, in which they ascribe Divinity to him.

Nor is there any room for an Evasion here by pleading, that by the Godhead, which is common to the Father and Son, he meant only *Dominion*; and that Christ is truly and properly God, as he has real Power and Authority derived from the Father: for our Author never dreamt of this profound Criticism, that confounds

found the Titles of *God and Lord*, which he always speaks of as very distinct : This would have alter'd his whole Scheme of Thoughts, and way of reasoning on this Subject ; *Moses* must have been allow'd to be a true God in the lower Sense, as clothed with real Authority and Power by God. ^h But, saith he, “ *Moses* was “ made a God before *Pharaoh* ; and yet he is “ not stiled *truly* Lord, or God by the Prophets, but is called by the Spirit, *Moses the faithful Servant of God*.”— But one Passage, if well consider'd, will fully clear this Point : When *Irenæus* comes to make use of the above-mention'd Rule for the Confutation of the Heretics who deny'd the supream Godhead of the Creator ; ⁱ “ This, saith he, manifestly confutes those Deceivers and perverse Sophisters, “ who say, He is God and Father by Nature, “ whom they have invented ; but the Creator “ is by Nature neither God nor Father, but “ only is stiled so, because he has Dominion “ over the Creation ; so say these perverse Critics, employing their Wit and Invention against God.” The *Valentinians*, it seems, when told, that the Creator is frequently stiled

^h iii. 6. 5. Et ipse autem *Moses* homo Dei existens, Deus quidem datus est ante Pharaonem : non autem verè Dominus appellatur, nec Deus vocatur à Prophetis, sed *Fidelis Moses* *Famulus* & *servus Dei*, dicitur à Spiritu ; quod & erat.

ⁱ iv. 1. 1. —Manifestè falsa ostenduntur ea quæ dicunt circumventores & perversissimi Sophistæ, dicentes, naturaliter & Deum & Patrem esse, quem ipsi adinvenerunt : Demiurgum vero naturaliter neque Deum, neque Patrem esse, sed verbo tenus dici, eò quod dominetur conditionis, sicut dicunt perversi Grammatici, excogitantes in Deum.

Conf. *Tertullian* adv. *Hermog.* c. 3. Deus substantiæ ipsius nomen, id est, Divinitatis ; Dominus vero non substantiæ, sed potestatis.

God in Scripture, endeavour'd to come off by an uncatholic Distinction, viz. *A Being may be called God, either upon account of the Divine Substance and Perfections; and in this Sense the Bythus only is God: or upon account of Divine Dominion, tho' he has not the Nature of God; and thus the Creator comes by the Title of God.* And this was one of their Mysteries, for which he calls 'em perverse Critics, that rack'd their Invention to ungod their Maker; and yet even *they* durst not carry the Criticism so far as to say, the Word *God* did not signify his metaphysical Nature and Substance, but only his Dominion over his Creatures; tho' this would have served their Purpose much better. 'Tis plain, however, our Author rejects the heretical Distinction of a God *by Nature*, and a God *by Dominion*, and the Criticism of those bright Men, who held, the Creator might be stiled God on the score of mere Dominion, without the Divine Nature and Substance.

Our Evidence for *Irenæus* his holding the Catholic Doctrine of Christ's Divinity runs not so low, that I need collect Passages to shew he stiles 'him- *God absolutely*, and compare them with his own Rule: I shall only take notice of one or two Places.

^k —“ All that saw God after his Resurrection;” which he repeats a little lower. Again: ^l “ The *Ebionites* receive not by Faith the Union of God and Man, viz. in the Person of

^k iii. 13. 1. — Cum prædixisset omnes qui Deum post resurrectionem viderunt, intulit, &c. & infra, — qui Deum viderunt, &c.

^l v. 1. 3. Vani autem & Ebionæi unionem Dei & hominis per fidem non recipientes. —

“ Christ.”

“ Christ.” Again:—^m “ Some hold, that God
 “ came into a World that was not his own.”

But I proceed to other Passages.

2. ⁿ “ If any one cannot find out the rea-
 “ sons of all things he enquires into, let him
 “ consider, that he is but a Man infinitely less
 “ than God, that he has receiv’d Grace but in
 “ part, and is not yet equal to, or like his Ma-
 “ ker; nor can have experience and insight in-
 “ to all things, as God: But by how much he,
 “ who was made to day, and had a beginning
 “ of his Birth, is less than him who was not
 “ made, but is ever the same; by so much, in
 “ respect of Knowledge and searching out the
 “ Causes of all things, must he be less than his
 “ Maker. For thou art not unmade, O Man,
 “ nor didst thou always co-exist with God, as
 “ his own Word: But thro’ his transcendent
 “ Goodness, having now a beginning of Ex-
 “ istence, thou gradually learnest from the
 “ Word the Dispensations of God that made
 “ thee.”

’Tis plain here, the Word, who teaches us
 Knowledge, is opposed to imperfect Man, as

^m v. 2. 1. Vani autem & qui in aliena dicunt Deum ve-
 nisse.——

ⁿ ii. 25. 3. Si autem & aliquis non invenerit causam om-
 nium quæ requiruntur, cogitet quia homo est in infinitum
 minor Deo, & qui ex parte acceperit gratiam, & qui non-
 dum æqualis, vel similis sit Factori, & qui omnium experien-
 tiam & cogitationem habere non possit, ut Deus: Sed in
 quantum minor est ab eo, qui factus non est, & qui semper
 idem est, ille qui hodie factus est, & initium facturæ accep-
 pit, in tantum secundum Scientiam & ad investigandum cau-
 sas omnium, minorem esse eo qui fecit. Non enim infectus
 (Gr. ἀγέννητος) es, ô homo, neque semper coexistebas Deo,
 sicut proprium ejus Verbum: sed propter eminentem boni-
 tatem ejus, nunc initium facturæ accipiens, sensum discis à
 Verbo dispositiones Dei, qui te fecit.

uncreated, eternal, and perfect in Knowledge; and this is so obvious, that it would never have been question'd; but to make the Passage consistent with Men's darling Schemes.—But the Argument and Scope, compared with the plain Expressions, abundantly determine the Sense of the Place, and leave no room for Evasions. To silence the Heretics, that were great Pretenders to Knowledge in Divine Mysteries, he argues, that Man should keep within the Bounds prescribed by Nature, and be content with limited and imperfect Knowledge: For Man, saith he, is but a Creature, that had a beginning; and perfect Knowledge is the Prerogative of the uncreated and eternal God: To pretend to it is to forget we are *made Beings*, and grasp at Divinity. On the one side of the Comparison is God, who knows all things, because he is an uncreated, necessarily existent, and absolutely eternal Being: On the other is Man, who can have but limited Knowledge with a mixture of Ignorance, because he is a created Being, that had a beginning, and consequently must be infinitely less than his Creator in all Perfections. Now if the Word be not included in the unmade Being, by the Author's Argument he must be infinitely inferior to God; as a Creature, that had a beginning of Existence, he must be imperfect in Knowledge, &c. which no Man in his Senses can believe to have been his Opinion. And indeed he leaves not this to Consequences, but expressly places the Word on the other side of the Comparison in opposition to imperfect, ignorant Man: Man, saith he, differs from the omniscient Being, as he had a beginning of his Existence: but *the Word had an eternal Co-existence with God*: for as *this co-existing ever with*

God is directly opposed to having a beginning of Birth and Existence, (ἀρχὴν γενέσεως,) of which imperfect Knowledge is a necessary Consequence, it must unavoidably signify absolute Co-eternity; and then his being unmade, and his necessary Existence, his surpassing Man infinitely in Knowledge and all Perfections, as God and Creator, are necessarily connected with this.—But see this Passage more fully vindicated in the Dissertation concerning the Word ἀγέννητος, &c. and compare Principle 3. above.

3. ° “ The *Magi* shew’d by their Gifts, who he was whom they worship’d; for they offer’d Myrrh, because he was to die—and be bury’d: and Gold, because he was that King, of whose Kingdom there is no end; and Frankincense, because he is God, who was made known in Judea, and manifested to them that sought him not.”

Christ’s Godhead, as contra-distinguish’d from his kingly Dominion, must signify his Divine Nature; in respect of which he shews, he was the God of *Israel*, of whom ’tis said, *he was known in Judah*,—Psal. lxxvi. 1. and who says by the Prophet, *I was made manifest to them that asked not after me*, Isa. lxxv. 1. And how should Frankincense have any reference to his being God, unless he supposed him to be *Jehovah*, to whom alone sweet Incense was offer’d daily under the Old Testament? and consequent-

° iii. 9. 2. Matthæus autem magos ab oriente venientes ait—per ea quæ obtulerunt munera ostendisse, quis erat qui adorabatur: Myrrham quidem, quod ipse erat, qui pro mortali humano genere moreretur & sepeliretur: Aurum vero, quoniam Rex, *cujus Regni finis non est*: Thus vero, quoniam Deus, qui & notus in *Judea* factus est, & manifestus eis, qui non quærebant eum.

ly he was the only true God, to whom they offer'd Sacrifices, and address'd all their religious Worship; for it had been Idolatry to burn Incense to any other.

4. ^P " He who suffer'd under *Pontius Pilate*, is the Lord of all, and King, and God, and Judge, receiving Power from the God of all, *because he was obedient to the Death.*"

The Words will bear, if not require, that the Genitive, *omnium*, of all, should be repeated, and joined with the other Substantives, thus; "*Christ is Lord, King, God, and Judge of all.*" And then, according to Dr. *Clarke*, they might be render'd to this Effect: *He is supream Lord, supream God, &c.*

5. ^a " Who shall declare his Generation? for he is Man, and who can know him? now he knows him to whom the Father—reveals him, to let him understand, that the Son of Man, who *was born not of the Will of the Flesh, nor of Man*, is Christ the Son of the living God. For we have shewn from the Scriptures, that no one of all the Sons of *Adam* is styled God or Lord, as he is. And all that

^P iii. 12. 9. ——— "Οτι ὁ παθὼν ἐπὶ Πολλῆς Πιλάτου, οὗτος κύριος πάντων, καὶ βασιλεὺς, καὶ Θεός, καὶ κριτὴς ἐστί· ———
Quoniam qui passus est sub Pontio Pilato, hic Dominus est omnium, & Rex, & Deus, & Judex; ab eo qui est omnium Deus, accipiens potestatem, quoniam *subjectus factus est usque ad mortem*, &c.

^a Ibid. 19. 2. Propter hoc Generationem ejus quis enarrabit? (Isa. liii. 8.) quoniam *homo est*, & quis agnosceat eum, (Jer. xvii. 9.) Cognoscit autem illum is, cui Pater qui est in Cœlis revelavit, ut intelligat, quoniam *is qui non ex voluntate carnis, neque ex voluntate viri natus est* Filius hominis, hic est Christus Filius Dei vivi. Quoniam enim nemo in totum ex filiis Adæ, Deus appellatur secundum eum, aut Dominus nominatur, ex Scripturis demonstravimus. Quoniam autem ipse
proprie

“ that never so little apply themselves to find out
 “ the Truth, may see, that he peculiarly, above
 “ all Men, that had ever a Being before, was
 “ preach’d as God, Lord, the everlasting King,
 “ and the Only-begotten, and the incarnate
 “ Word, by all the Prophets, the Apostles,
 “ and the Spirit himself.—And upon account
 “ of his twofold Generation, viz. that glorious
 “ one of the most high Father, and his extra-
 “ ordinary Birth of the Virgin, the Scriptures
 “ witness concerning him, both that he should
 “ be a suffering Man, without Form or Com-
 “eliness;—and also the Lord the Holy One,
 “ the *Wonderful Counsellor*, Isa. ix. 6. *Fairer*
 “ *than the Children of Men*, Psal. xlv. 2. and the
 “ mighty God, as the Judge of all coming in
 “ the Clouds, Dan. vii. 13.

He is Man—) So the LXX render the He-
 brew Word מֶלֶךְ, reading it with other points,
 מִלֵּךְ, a Man, Jer. xvii. 9. and so the Syriac Ver-
 sion gives the Sense of it; *Man is hard-hearted*
above all.

Here he gives us two glorious Titles of Christ
 from the Prophecy, Isa. ix. 6. *The Wonderful*
Counsellor, the Mighty God. If we consider
 how much he valu’d and prefer’d the Version
 ascrib’d to the 70 Interpreters, looking upon

propriè præter omnes, qui tunc fuerunt homines, Deus, &
 Dominus, & Rex æternus, & Unigenitus, & Verbum incar-
 natum prædicatur & à Prophetis omnibus, & Apostolis, &
 ab ipso Spiritu, adest videre omnibus qui vel modicum de ve-
 ritate attigerint.—Sed quoniam præclaram præter omnes
 habuit in se eam, quæ est ab altissimo Patre, genituram, præ-
 clarâ autem functus est & eâ, quæ est ex Virgine, genera-
 tione; utraque Scripturæ divinæ de eo testificantur: & quo-
 niam homo indecorus & passibilis—& quoniam Dominus
 sanctus & Mirabilis, Consiliarius, & decorus Specie, & Deus
 fortis, super nubes veniens univerforum Judex.—

'em as almost inspired in translating the Scripture, and what little regard he had to other Translations, 't it will appear most probable, that the more correct Copies of the LXX had this Text then according to the *Hebrew*. And elsewhere he joins this Text with a Clause of the preceding Chapter, and gives us the true literal Version, ^f " I came unto the Prophets, " and she brought forth a Son, and his Name " is called *Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God*."

A place of such sublime Sense was liable to be misunderstood ; this occasion'd its being interpolated in the vulgar Copies ; other Versions of the Words, or even ignorant Glosses were set down in the Margin, and by the Ignorance and Inattention of Transcribers crept into the Text ; and either juttled out the original pure Translation, or were joined with it ; so that 'tis not easy to distinguish 'em : Thus the *Alexandrian* MS. has manifestly two rendrings of the Words *Wonderful Counsellor*. And it would seem *Irenæus* read both, tho' perhaps not in the same Copies ; for elsewhere he has, *μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος*, *The Angel of the Great Counsel* ; which is a Gloss rather than Translation : This is a Title of the Messias, who is *the Angel of the Covenant*, Mal, iii. 1. but, I think, has no reference to the Covenant here ; but is to be un-

* iii. 21. 3, 4. Cum tantâ igitur veritate & gratiâ Dei interpretatæ sint Scripturæ——verè impudorati & audaces ostenduntur, qui nunc volunt aliter interpretationes facere——unus enim & idem Spiritus Dei——in Prophetis quidem bene præconavit,——in Senioribus autem interpretatus est bene——

^f iv. 33. 11. ——Veni ad Prophetam, & peperit Filium, & vocatur nomen ejus Admirabilis, Consiliarius, Deus fortis.

derstood,

derstood, as *Jer.* xxxii. according to the *Hebrew*, and *xxix.* according to the *LXX.* v. 19. *κύριος ὁ μέγας βεβλής*, i. e. *The Lord great in Counsel*: And the Word *Angel* came in to explain the Word, *פלא*, *Wonderful*, by comparing it with what the Angel, afterwards called God, said to *Manoah*, *Judg.* xiii. 18. *Why askest thou after my Name, seeing it is פלא, Wonderful?* *

The Son of God appeared to bring messages to Men under the Old Testament, by way of Prelude to his Incarnation, and the Form of a Servant he was to assume; and by his Condescension concealed his highest Character: His Name was Secret and Wonderful. But he was such an Angel, as was also *the Mighty God*. We need go no farther than to the next Chapter to find this is a peculiar Title of the God of *Israel*, *Isa.* x. 21. *The Remnant shall return—to the Mighty God*, *אל אל נבור*; The Words are the same.

6. “ And that the Son of God, who is God,
“ would come from the southern part of the
“ Inheritance of *Juda*, and he that was of *Beth-*
“ *lehem*, where the Lord was born, would send
“ forth his Praise into all the Earth; as saith
“ the Prophet *Habakkuk*: *God shall come from*
“ *the South*, (Heb. *Teman*,) *and the Holy One*
“ *from Mount Effrem*, (Heb. *Paran* :) *His Power*
“ *cover’d the Heavens, and the Earth is full of*

* V. Philon. de nominum mutatione, pag. 810.

iv. 20. 4. —Et quoniam ex eâ parte, quæ est secundum Africum hæreditatis Judæ, veniet Filius Dei, qui Deus est, & qui erat ex *Bethleem*, ubi natus est Dominus, in omnem terram emittet laudationem ejus, sicut ait *Habacuc* Propheta: *Deus ab Africo* veniet, & Sanctus de Monte *Effrem*. Cooperuit Cælum virtus ejus, & laudatione ejus plena est terra.—Manifestè significans, quoniam Deus, & quoniam in *Bethleem* adventus ejus, & ex Monte *Effrem*,—& quoniam homo.

“ *his Praise*, Hab. iii. 3, 4. Plainly declaring
 “ that he is God, and that he would come at
 “ *Bethlehem*, and from Mount *Effrem* ; —
 “ and that he is Man.” —

His professed Scope here is to prove that Christ is God as well as Man : and as his being Man signifies his having the Nature of Man, so by force of the Opposition, his being God is his having the Divine Nature, *i. e.* the Essence and Perfections of God. He allows that Maxim, τὸ ἐκ Θεῆ γεννηθὲν, Θεός ἐστι. *He that is begotten of God, is God* : for the Son of God, saith he, is God, viz. as the Son of Man is Man. And he supposes Christ is stiled God absolutely, with the Article, and in the subject of a Proposition in Scripture, ὁ Θεός ἐκ θαύμαν (ἀπὸ νότου, *ex Theodotione, aut forte Glossa Marginali*) ἥξει. κ. τ. ε. He has the Titles of the God of *Israel*, and the same Glory and Majesty is ascribed to him, as may be seen in the Context refer'd to.

7. “ God then became Man, and the Lord
 “ himself saved us, giving the Sign of the Vir-
 “ gin.”

This is the Result of the Argument display'd in the last Passage and Context, by which he proves that Christ was God as well as Man : The Laws of Argumentation require the Terms shou'd have the same Sense and Emphasis in the Conclusion, that they had in the Premisses : now what God does he speak of in his Proofs ? no less than the *God of Israel*, the *Holy One*, stiled God absolutely, and with the Article, and with a suitable display of his incomparable Majesty,

“ iv. 21. 1. Ὁ Θεὸς οὗν ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο, καὶ αὐτὸς κύριος ἔσται ἡμῶν, ὃς τὸ τῆς παρθένου σημεῖον. Deus igitur homo factus est, & ipse Dominus salvavit nos, ipse dans Virginis signum.

as we have seen above; That God of whom the Prophet *Isaiah* saith, Chap. xxxv. 4. — *Behold our God*—— *He himself will come and save us.* And Chap. lxiii. 9. *The Lord himself will save us:* as he cites him according to the Greek of the LXX.—The only God of *Israel*, of whom the Prophet *Micah* saith, Chap. vii. 18, 19. *Who is a God like unto thee?*——*He will turn again; he will have Compassion upon us, &c.* For from these and other Texts he proves his Godhead: Since then in the Premises we have God absolutely in the only proper Sense, and with the Article too; 'tis too late to begin to strip it of its Emphasis in the Conclusion: This God, who was made Man, is the only true God, of whom he said such great things before.

But tho' 'tis undeniable Fact, that here Christ is stiled God with the Article, and absolutely, *i. e.* without any addition to restrain and limit the Sense, yet Dr. *Clarke* denies its unlimited, or absolute Acceptation, because it refers to what went before, and so is to be resolved thus;
ὁ ἐν ὑπαδέχων Θεός.

Concerning this I would observe a few Particulars.

1. The Doctor's Rule is, that when Θεός, God, is put absolutely, and with the Article, it must always signify God in the highest Sense, that is the Person of the Father: now according to this new shift, it must be farther limited thus; “*so that ὁ Θεός, be not apply'd to a Person spoken of before:*” And then the Rule will be of very little use; for after we have had the term once, as for instance in the first Verse of the Bible, it presently loses its Spirit, and has a limited Sense, or is capable of it. Again, if the inspired Writers of the New Testament had

stiled Christ ὁ Θεός never so often, after they had once signify'd the Person of the Son, this would not have given any Light in this Controversy; it must have been brought down to a low Sense, ὁ ὑπάρχων Θεός, *who being a God*, i. e. a Person exalted to great Power.

Certainly this Evasion would have done the *Valentinians* great Service; for in answer to *Ireneus*, who proves the supreme Godhead of the Father and Son, from their being stiled *God absolutely* in Scripture, they might have said, ὁ Θεός, or Θεός, has always a Reference to the God of the *Jews*, and even in the first of *Genesis* the subject matter limits the Sense to the Creator; and is thus to be resolv'd, ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεός, i. e. ὁ δημιουργὸς ὑπάρχων Θεός: *The Creator being a God.*

But if the Doctor says, that when once the Word is used in the absolute, highest Sense, it must have the same Acceptation in the Repetition of it, by virtue of its reference to the Subject spoken of; then let this be but apply'd to the Passage under Consideration, and all is well; for we have seen Christ is stiled God absolutely, and with the Article, and under the highest Characters in the preceding Paragraph.

2. His Resolution of the Word *God*, with the Article, is impertinent: for, if we should suppose that we Christians had *Gods many*, and speaking of one particular God, should stile him ὁ Θεός, the Article in that Case would have the same Sense as if it were ὁ Θεός, i. e. *the God I am speaking of.* But if *Moses* were the Subject of Discourse, would any understanding Person presently say concerning him, ὁ Θεός ἐλάλησεν—*God spake to the Children of Israel*, and think to come off by saying his Meaning was,

was, ὁ Μωυσῆς ὑπάγων θεός; i. e. *Moses being a God to Pharaο spake, &c.*

3. This Criticism is grounded on a Supposition of more Gods than one. When we meet with θεός, or ὁ θεός in a Pagan Writer, we must look backward to find out whether 'tis *Jupiter*, or *Apollo*, or *Mercury*, &c. but to us Christians there is but one God. However, since *Irenæus* proves, the Scripture stiles Christ God absolutely, and infers from it, that he is *God in the primary Sense*, why should any Attempts be made, against plain Fact, to evade the absolute Sense of the Word in himself? But *Irenæus* has fully expressed the Emphasis of the Term, ὁ θεός, by calling him *the Lord himself* in the same Passage. Now since he takes this Expression from the Old Testament, he cannot mean by it any subordinate Lord, supposed by the *Arians* to be revealed in the New Testament; but the supreme Lord, who spake by the Prophets. And the very Expression implies his coming in Person to save us, in Opposition to any Agent or Messenger: For if the Lord had sent another, he had not saved us *himself*. The Scriptures he had in his Eye here seem to be these, *Isa. vii.*
14. The Lord himself shall give you a Sign. — compared with chap. xxxv. 4. *Behold our God—himself* (Gr. αὐτός, *he himself*) *will come and save you*; which he understood of the Son of God: Or rather, chap. lxi. 9. which runs thus, as cited from the LXX. by *Irenæus*, “*not a Messenger or Angel, but the Lord himself saved them*,” i. e. God will not send another as a substitute or inferior Agent, but will come *in Person*, as we express it, to save his People: For God comes

⁂ See this Text considered, chap. vi. N°. 15.

himself,

himself, or *in Person*, when any of the three Divine Persons come; the Sense of the Expression being no more, than that God saves us *immediately*, and not by any under-Agent: So that there is no room here for metaphysical Subtilties and Quibbles about the Word *Person*.

Now if any will infer from hence, that according to this Exposition of his Words, *Irenæus* must have held, that the Son is the Person of the Father, and so was a *Sabellian*: I answer, this Consequence being grounded on some metaphysical Speculations of a modern Scheme, which our Author knew nothing of, is unjustly imposed upon him, as his Opinion: For whether the Criticism and Maxim about *Person and Being* be true or false, they can be of no use to find out his Meaning, unless it do appear they were owned by him. We might with as much Justice make use of Maxims of modern Philosophy, as *Newton's Principia*, to settle the Meaning of Passages in *Plato* or *Aristotle*. It will be time enough to vindicate him from the Imputation of *Sabellianism*, when a serious Charge is advanced against him.

8. * “ Christ saith to ’em again: *And you*
 “ *have made void the Word of God by your Tra-*
 “ *dition*; manifestly owning him to be Father
 “ and God, who said in the Law: *Honour thy*
 “ *Father and Mother*.—For the true God con-
 “ fessed a Précept of the Law to be the Word

* iv. 9. 3. —Et iterum ait eis: *Et frustrati estis Sermo-*
nem Dei propter traditionem vestram, Mat. xv. 6. Manifest-
 tissimè Patrem & Deum confitens Christus eum, qui in lege
 dixit, *Honora Patrem & Matrem*: Exod. xx. 12. —Ver-
 bum enim Dei confessus est Legis præceptum verax Deus, &
 neminem alterum Deum appellavit, quam suum Patrem.

“ of God ; and yet called none God, but his
“ Father.”

Here our Saviour is stiled the true God, (Gr. ὁ ἀληθῆς, or ἀληθινὸς θεός) in the subject of a Proposition, in opposition to the Blasphemy of the Heretics against the God of the Old Testament, whose Word they would not take for a Proof of his being the *only true God*. And possibly they might suppose the Title of the *true God*, 1 *Joh.* v. 20. was to distinguish him from the God of the *Jews*, whose true Godhead they deny'd : I think *Irenæus* took this Title from that Text, and that it denotes *primarily, and directly* the Truth of his Godhead, and *consequentially* of his Word : But if it signify only his Veracity, as the *Latin* Interpreter renders it, it comes to the same Sense ; for *the God of Truth, the God that cannot lie*, are incommunicable Characters of the God of *Israel*.

9. y “ The moral Precepts common to both
“ Testaments are Proofs of one and the same
“ God : And this is our Lord, the Word of
“ God, who first made Men Servants to God,
“ and afterwards gave them Liberty,—as he
“ saith to his Disciples ; *Henceforth I call you*
“ *not Servants, Joh. xv. 15.—but I have called you*
“ *Friends.*—By saying, *now I call you not Ser-*
“ *vants*, he plainly hints, that it was himself
“ that imposed upon Men a Yoke of Servitude
“ to

* iv. 13. 4. Assentire Deo, & sequi ejus verbum, — & quæcunq; talia communia utrisq; sunt, unum & eundem ostendunt Deum. Hic est autem Dominus noster, Verbum Dei, qui primo quidem servos attraxit Deo, postea autem liberavit eos : — quemadmodum ipse ait discipulis : *Jam non dicam vos servos—vos autem dixi amicos*, Joh. xv. 19. — In eo enim quod dicit : *Jam non dicam vos servos*, manifestissimè

“ to God by the Law, and afterwards gave ’em
 “ Liberty. — And by calling his Disciples
 “ Friends of God, he manifestly shews, that
 “ he is the Word of God, whom *Abraham* fol-
 “ lowed, — and so became the Friend of
 “ God. —

As sometimes, speaking of the one God, he says,
 He is the Father, not excluding the Son; so here
 he affirms the same of the Son: *The one God of
 the Old and New Testament is our Lord Jesus
 Christ.*

10. ² “ And when *John* could not bear the
 “ Vision, (for, *I fell at his Feet, saith he, as
 “ dead,* Rev. i. 17. so that the Scripture was
 “ fulfilled: *No Man shall see God, and live,* Exod.
 “ xxxiii. 20.) the Word revived him.

11. ^a “ The spiritual Man shall judge the
 “ *Ebionites*: How can they be saved, if he was
 “ not God (ὁ θεός) who work’d their Salvati-
 “ on on Earth? or how shall Man attain to
 “ Union with God, unless God (ὁ θεός) dwelt
 “ in Man, and became Man.”

The *Ebionites* deny’d Christ’s Divinity: In
 opposition to ’em he asserts his supreme Deity
 in plain and full terms, calling him God abso-

nifestissimè significavit se esse, qui primo quidem eam servi-
 tute, quæ est erga Deum, hominibus per legem constitue-
 rit, post deinde libertatem eis donaverit. — In eo autem
 quod amicos Dei dicit suos discipulos, manifestè ostendit se
 esse Verbum Dei, quem & *Abraham* — sequens, amicus fac-
 tus est Deo. —

² Ibid. 20. 11. Joanne vero non sustinente visionem, (*ce-
 cidi*, enim inquit, *ad pedes ejus quasi mortuus*, ut fieret, quod
 scriptum est: *nemo videt Deum, & vivet.*) & vivificans eum
 Verbum, &c.

^a Ibid. 33. 4. Ἀνακρινῶν δὲ καὶ τοὺς Ἑβιωνῆς πῶς δύναται
 σωθῆναι, εἰ μὴ ὁ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ τὴν σωτηρίαν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἐργασά-
 μενος; ἢ πῶς ἄνθρωπος χωρήσει εἰς Θεόν, εἰ μὴ ὁ Θεὸς ἐχωρήθῃ
 εἰς ἄνθρωπον.

lutely with the Article twice: By God he must mean one that has the Nature, *i. e.* the Essence and infinite Perfections of God, as appears by the Opposition to Man, which signifies the *humane Nature*; otherwise why might not a *Man exalted* and *made a God* be our Saviour, if he meant only a God by Office and Dominion over us? —And let it be observed, he asserts also the Saviour's Godhead, as a Qualification necessary, in the Nature of the Thing, and not merely by Divine Appointment, and consequently the utter Incompetency of any Creature for this Office: which is an Article of pure, primitive Doctrine, in opposition to their Blasphemy, who say, *any one might have been appointed our Saviour.*

12. ^a “ When our Lord forgave Sins, he
 “ both healed the Man, and plainly shewed,
 “ who himself was; for *since none can forgive*
 “ *Sins but God only*; and yet our Lord did
 “ forgive 'em, and heal *Men*; 'tis evident, that
 “ he was the Word of God, made the Son of
 “ Man, and receiving from the Father Power
 “ to forgive Sins, because he is Man, and be-
 “ cause he is God; that as he suffered with us,
 “ as Man; so as God he might have Mercy on
 “ us, and forgive us our Debts, we owe to God
 “ our Maker.

^a v. 17, 3. Peccata igitur remittens, hominem quidem curavit, semetipsum autem manifeste ostendit quis esset. Si enim nemo potest remittere peccata, nisi solus Deus; remittebat autem hæc Dominus, & curabat homines: manifestum, quoniam ipse erat Verbum Dei, Filius hominis factus, à Patre potestatem remissionis peccatorum accipiens, quoniam homo, & quoniam Deus: ut quomodo homo compassus est nobis, tanquam Deus misereatur nostri, & remittat nobis debita nostra, quæ factori nostro debemus Deo.

No one can with any Attention and Impartiality read these Words, but must see, he allows the Truth of these Principles, *viz.* *None can forgive Sin, but God alone*, which is expressed. —And *He that forgives, must be that very God, to whom we were Debtors.* And he thus reasons: None can forgive Sins, but God alone: Christ forgave Sins: The Conclusion should be; *therefore Christ is God.* But this was not particular enough; this had left it undetermin'd whether he was the Father, or the Son, or Holy Spirit: The Sense of his Conclusion is, “It is evident, that he was God, not the Father, for He was not incarnate, nor was wont immediately to converse with Men, but the Word, or Son appearing in our Nature.” And according to *Irenæus* to be the *Word of God* is *to be God*, only with a personal Distinction. The *Arian* Sense of these Words is evidently false, *viz.* Therefore he is one that has Authority from God to forgive Sins, for this would not discover who he was; he might be no more than an ordinary Prophet having a Commission to declare the Pardon of Sin, as *Nathan* the Prophet, 2 *Sam.* xii. 13. And tho’ he speaks of Christ’s receiving Power to forgive Sins as the Son of Man, and Saviour sent into the World, referring to his own Words, *Mat.* ix. 6. Yet he does not quit his Principle, *viz.* *that he must be God, who forgives Sins*, nor lay the stress of it upon his having a Commission from God: For he still expresseth the Necessity of his being God in order to exercise this Royal Power of granting Forgiveness of Sins: He was qualify’d for it by his being Man and God: As Man, he could have Compassion on those, whose Nature he wore;

and as God, he could grant pardon of Sins, which is an Act of infinite Mercy, and the Prerogative of that God, against whom we had sinned. The mere ministerial declaring of Pardon does not require, he should be God, nor is it an Act of Mercy, but of Obedience, in the Servant, that brings the Message. But Christ's forgiving Sin is *exercising his Mercy*, as he expresses it, referring to *Mic. vii. 19.* or *Psal. li. 1.* &c. And he grants it in a Royal Manner, as a Prince forgives Offences committed against his own Government. If we look back to the beginning of the Chapter, we shall see, that *Irenæus* supposes God the Father and the Son to be one and the same God, whose Precept Man transgress'd in Paradise. " ^b The Precept was given to Man by the Word: *For Adam, saith he, heard the Voice of the Lord God,* Gen. iii. 8. The Word then might well say to the Man, *thy Sins are forgiven thee,* Mat. ix. 2. The very same, whom we had sinned against in the Beginning, granting remission of Sins in the End; or else, if we had transgress'd the Command of one, and it had been another, that said: *Thy Sins are forgiven thee;* he had neither been good, nor true, nor just." Observe, he not only infers from the Son's granting Forgiveness, that the Father, whose Command

^b Ibid. N^o. 1. Datum est autem præceptum homini per Verbum: *Audixit enim Adam, ait, vocem Domini Dei.* Bene igitur Verbum ejus ad hominem dicit: Remittuntur tibi peccata; idem ille, in quem peccaveramus in initio, remissionem peccatorum in fine donans. Aut si alterius quidem transgressi sumus præceptum, alius autem erat qui dixit: *Remittuntur tibi peccata tua;* neq; bonus, neq; verax, neq; justus est hujusmodi.

Man disobeyed, grants it, but says expressly, *the Word is the same, against whom we sinned: Idem ille*, does not, cannot refer to the Father; the Construction will not bear it, but agrees plainly with the Logos: *Verbum ejus*—*idem ille*—*Gr. λόγος αὐτοῦ—ὁ αὐτός.*—Had it been the Ablative absolute, it might have seem'd ambiguous; but now there is no Ambiguity in it. Besides, his asserting, that he who said; *Thy Sins are forgiven thee*, is one and the same with him, whose Precept we transgress'd, confirms the same Sense; for he never ascribes these Words to the Father.

C H A P. V.

Passages expressing the Son's Consubstantiality, or being of the same Nature and Essence with the Father: The Generation of the Son considered.

ALL the Passages already produced prove our Lord's Consubstantiality (τὸ ὁμοῦσιον) with the Father, which implies no more, than his *having the same Divine Nature*, without intruding into Things we have not seen, or determining whether it be a numerical, or only specific Sameness, or somewhat different from both, and peculiar to the Three Persons of the ever-blessed Trinity, who are not separate, like Three Individuals of the human Species, nor so much one, as a single Individual, which would destroy their distinct Personality. I shall now add some Testimonies, that plainly shew, Christ is not another God, but the same God with the Father.

I. 2 " *Peter*

1. ^a “*Peter did not declare another God, but gave them notice of the Son of God, who became Man, and suffered.*

Again: “^b The Apostles preached the Son of God, whom Men knew not,—but did not introduce another God.

2. ^c “*I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob: God is not the God of the Dead, but of the Living.* Matth. xxii. 29, 30, 31. —“ Hereby our Lord plainly shew’d, that he that spake to Moses from the Bush, and declared himself to be the God of the Fathers, is the God of the Living. For who is the God of the Living, but the God who I S, above whom there is no other God? Whom also the Prophet Daniel declared, when Cyrus King of Persia said to him; *Why dost thou not worship Bel?* He answered: *Because I worship*

^a iii. 12. 3. Ὁυκ ἄλλον θεὸν καταγγέλλων, ἀλλὰ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον γεγενότα, καὶ παθόντα, εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν αἰγών τὸν Ἰσραήλ,

^b Ibid. No. 7. —Filius ergo Dei, quem ignorabant homines, annuntiabant Apostoli, —sed non alterum Deum inferebant.

^c iv. 5. 2. —Ego sum Deus Abraham, & Deus Isaac, & Deus Jacob, & adjecit: non est Deus mortuorum, sed viventium, —Per hæc utiq; manifestum fecit, quoniam is qui de Rubo locutus Moyfi, & manifestavit se esse Deum patrum, hic est viventium Deus. Quis enim est vivorum Deus, nisi qui est Deus, super quem alius non est Deus? Quem & Daniel Propheta, cum dixisset ei Cyrus Rex Persarum, *Quare non adoras Bel?* annuntiavit dicens: *Quoniam non colo Idola manufacta, sed vivum Deum.* —Iterum dixit: Dominum Deum meum adorabo, quoniam hic est Deus vivus. Qui igitur à Prophetis adorabatur Deus vivus, hic est vivorum Deus, & Verbum ejus, qui & loquutus est Moyfi, qui & Sacerdotes redarguit, qui & Resurrectionem donavit. —Ipse igitur Christus cum Patre vivorum est Deus, qui loquutus est Moyfi, qui & Patribus manifestatus est.

“ not

“ not Idols made with Hands, but the Living
 “ God: —Again; I will worship, said he, the
 “ Lord my God, because he is the Living God.
 “ Therefore the Living God, who was wor-
 “ shipped by the Prophets, he is the God of
 “ the Living, and his Word, who spake to
 “ Moses, confuted the Sadducees, and gave the
 “ Resurrection. — Therefore Christ him-
 “ self with the Father is the God of the Liv-
 “ ing, who spake to Moses, and appeared to
 “ the Fathers.

Irenæus could not invent Words more plain
 and full to express, that our Saviour is the su-
 preme God, the same God with the Father.
 He proves him to be the God of the Living,
 who spake to *Moses* from the Bush, and said;
I am the God of Abraham, &c. and who was
 worshipped, as the Living God. And the
 God of the Living is the supreme God, the
 God that *IS*, above whom there is no other
 God: Yea, afterwards he shews, he is the only
 God: “^d *Abraham believed first, that he is the*
 “ *Maker of Heaven and Earth, the only God.*

And then he joins Christ and the Father to-
 gether, and asserts, that they are the God (not
 the Gods) of the Living; so that he is the
 same God with the Father, and *he and his Fa-
 ther are one*, Joh. x. 30.

Dr. *Whitby's* Answer to this Passage, as ci-
 ted by Bp. *Bull*, is hardly to be parallel'd.
^e After he had taken pains to shew, that it was
 not the Father, but the Son, that appeared in

^d Ibid. N^o. 3. —Credidit Abraham Deo; —primum
 quidem, quoniam ipse est Factor Cœli & terræ, solus
 Deus. —

^e Disquisit. Mod. pp. 122, 123, 124, 125.

the Bush, and said, *I am the God of Abraham, &c.* Stupidly imagining, Dr. Bull was his Adversary in this; whereas he is only confuting an Error of the Press (*Patrem* for *Patrum*) in *Irenæus's* own Words, little thinking, he was all the while betraying his wretched Cause: He answers, by denying *him that spake to Moses out of the Bush to be the God of the Living* §, which is contradicting, not answering *Irenæus*: For 'tis evident, saith he, *that he who spake from the Bush to Moses—is the God of the Living.* Again, *The Living God, and his Word, who spake to Moses,—is the God of the Living.* Again, *Christ himself with the Father is the God of the Living, who spake to Moses, and appeared to the Fathers.* But he contradicts a greater than *Irenæus*, even Christ himself, who plainly teaches, that he who said to *Moses, I am the God of Abraham, &c.* is the God of the Living.

And finally, he contradicts *himself*; for he comes afterwards to give some Account of Christ's being the God of the Living. Now instead of a fair Account of these plain and full Expressions of *Irenæus*, the Dr. has recourse to a Piece of *Arian* Machinery, often used to help 'em out in great Distress, viz. *The Son as the Father's Messenger and Representative spake in his Person, when he said, I am the God of Abraham, &c.*

§ Ibid. Falsa est ergo præsulis propositio, *Is qui de rubo Moyfi locutus est, est Deus vivorum.*

Irenæus. —Is qui de rubo locutus est Moyfi, & manifestavit se esse Deum Patrum, hic est viventium Deus.——

Et post pauca:—Deus vivus, hic est vivorum Deus, & Verbum ejus, qui & locutus est Moyfi.——

Et postea: Ipse igitur Christus cum Patre vivorum est Deus, qui loquutus est Moyfi.——

This

This Evasion is grounded on a Supposition, that Persons' employed to carry Messages, were wont to speak in the Person of their Masters, and in the same Stile and Language, as if their Principals were present, and spoke themselves; which has not so much as a Shew of Probability, nor has been supported by one plain Fact: *Rabshakeb* speaks in his Master's Name; and yet durst not say, *I am the King of Assyria*: but *thus saith the Great King*——2 King xviii. 19, &c. The Prophets often repeat, *thus saith the Lord*: the Angel that appeared to *Zacharias* said not, *I am God Almighty*, but *I am Gabriel*, &c. Luke i. 19. Besides, if this were true, as Christ might have said, *I am the Father*: So had he asserted never so often, that he was *the most High God*, this Shift would have served 'em to get clear of such Testimonies, as well as others.

But even supposing the Truth of this Subterfuge, 'tis wholly impertinent in this Case, and is brought in without any Judgment or Modesty: For 'tis Demonstration, that *Irenæus* knew nothing of it; else he could not have inferred from the Words spoken in the Bush, that the *Son was the God of the Living*, as he certainly does, but only that he was *his Representative and Messenger*. And is there any Sense or Candor in explaining an Author by a Maxim disowned by him? Besides, though an Angel might say, *I am God the Father*; and *Rabshakeb* might say, *I am the Great King of Assyria*, or *I am Sennacherib*; which is ridiculous to suppose: Yet no Man in his Senses, would say of them in the third Person, *The Angel is God Almighty*, or *Gabriel has made it evident, that he is Jehovah*; or *Rabshakeb is the Great*

great King ; much less would any one be so ridiculous, as to join them together in this manner : *Jehova and his Angel are God Almighty* ; or *Rabshakeh and Sennacherib are the King of Assyria*. Why must we be troubled with such Impertinencies !—Have these Men no Knowledge ?

3. ^g “ Our Lord taught us, that none can
 “ know God, without God’s teaching of him,
 “ that is, God is not to be known without
 “ God.—And the Father was manifested
 “ by the Word himself made capable to be seen
 “ and felt, tho’ all did not equally believe him ;
 “ but all saw the Father in the Son : for the
 “ Father is that which is invisible of the Son,
 “ and the Son is that which is to be seen of the
 “ Father.”

The plainest Words may be perplexed with metaphysical Subtilties : but these Expressions, taken in their native Simplicity, strongly set forth the close and ineffable Union of the Father and Son in the same Nature and Godhead. And both are God according to the former part of the Passage ; the Father cannot be known without the Son revealing him, that is, God is not to be known without God.

4. ^h “ It was not *one* that was known, and
 “ *another* that said, *No Man knows the Father* ;
 “ but

^g iv. 6. 4. Edocuit autem Dominus, quoniam Deum scire nemo potest, nisi Deo docente, hoc est, sine Deo non cognosci Deum. *Et postea*, N^o. 6.—Et per ipsum Verbum visibilem & palpabilem factum, Pater ostendebatur, etiam si non omnes similiter credebant ei ; sed omnes viderunt in Filio Patrem : Invisibile etenim Filii Pater, visibile autem Patris Filius.

^h Ibid. N^o 7. Non ergo alius erat qui cognoscebatur, & alius qui dicebat : *Nemo cognoscit Patrem* ; sed unus & idem,
 K omnia

“ but one and the same, whom the Father made
 “ all things subject to, and who received Testi-
 “ mony from all, that he is *truly Man, and truly*
 “ *God*, from the Father, the Spirit, the An-
 “ gels, the Creation it self, from Men, and
 “ apostate Spirits and Devils, from the Enemy,
 “ and finally from Death it self.”

If he means that the *Son* spoken of, *Mat. xi.*
27. and *our Saviour*, that spoke these Words,
 are one and the same, it must be understood of
 the *same Person*. But since in the Words, as here
 cited, the Father only is mention'd, and the
 Character, (*qui cognoscebatur*) *he that was known*,
 best suits the Father, the most natural and obvi-
 ous Sense of 'em is, that *Christ the Son and the*
Father are one and the same ; as *Joh. x. 3.* *I and*
my Father are one : that is, one, not in *Person*,
 but in *Nature and Godhead* ; for since he is *truly*
God, as here he explains himself, he must be
 one and the same God ; for there are not two
 Gods.

§. i “ God the Father, and his Word, that
 “ is always present with Mankind, are one and
 “ the same.”

The Generation of the Son may properly fall
 under Consideration here, because it will far-
 ther confirm his Consubstantiality, as well as
 Coëternity. I shall gradually proceed in enqui-
 ring into *Irenæus's* Doctrine concerning this in-
 effable Mystery.

omnia subiciente ei Patre, & ab omnibus accipiens testimo-
 nium, quoniam verè homo, & quoniam verè Deus, à Patre,
 à Spiritu, ab Angelis, ab ipsa Conditione, ab hominibus, & ab
 Apostaticis Spiritibus, & Dæmoniis, & ab inimico, & no-
 vissimè ab ipsa morte.

ⁱ iv. 28. 2. Cum sit unus & idem Deus Pater, & Verbum
 ejus, semper adistens humano generi. —

1. ^k “ A Son, as one has observed before
 “ us, may be two ways understood: one is a
 “ Son by Nature, because he is begotten; and
 “ another is reputed a Son, *as he is made so*:
 “ tho’ there be a difference between that which
 “ is begotten, and that which is made. For
 “ the one is begotten of him (the Father,) and
 “ the other is made by him, either as created,
 “ or formed by Instruction.”

Here Generation is contra-distinguish’d from
 Creation and other Methods of making Sons,
 and is allow’d to be the only Foundation of true
 Filiation: He who is begotten, is really a Son,
 and that by Nature; but he that is made a Son
 by Creation or otherwise, is only a *reputed Son*.

2. ¹ “ *And the Word was God*;—rightly in-
 “ fer’d; for that which is begotten of God, is
 “ God.—

Whether these are our Author’s own Words,
 or only reported from the Reasonings of the
Valentinians, they certainly contain a Catholic
 Maxim, mentioned without the least Mark of
 Disapprobation. Compare Chap. 4. N^o 6. and
 Note there. And *Theophilus of Antioch*^m. *And*
the Word was God.—*The Word then is God*,

^k iv. 41. 2. Filius enim, quemadmodum & quidam ante
 nos dixit, dupliciter intelligitur: alius quidem secundum natu-
 ram, eo quod natus sit Filius; alius autem secundum id quod
 factus est, reputatur Filius: licet sit differentia inter natum
 & factum. Quoniam ille quidem ex eo natus est, ille autem
 ab ipso factus est, sive secundum Conditionem, sive secun-
 dum Doctrinæ magisterium.

¹ 1. 8. 5. καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, ἀκολουθῶν τὸ ᾧ ἐκ Θεοῦ γεννη-
 θέν, Θεὸς ἐστίν. Vet. Interp. *Et Deus erat Verbum*, consequen-
 ter; quod enim ex Deo natum est, Deus est.

^m *Theophil. ad Autolyicum*, L. 2. p. 130. Ed. Oxon.—καὶ Θεὸς
 ἦν ὁ λόγος.—Θεὸς ἔν ᾧ ὁ λόγος, καὶ ἐκ Θεοῦ πεφυκώς.—

and begotten of God.—And Tertullian: ⁿ *We have learned, that this Word was prolated by God, and by Prolation begotten; and is therefore stiled the Son of God, and God from the Unity of Substance.—So that what came forth from God, is God, and the Son of God, and both are one.*

I shall give his Doctrine of the Generation of the Son in these Propositions.

I. Prop. Christ, with respect to his highest Nature, was ineffably begotten of God the Father; and by this mysterious Generation is the Son of God, and very God, as by his Birth of the Virgin he became true Man.

1. ° “ One of the Gospels declares his princely, powerful, and glorious Birth of the Father, saying: *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.*

2. P “ Because of his transcendently glorious Generation of the most high Father, and his extraordinary Birth of the Virgin, the Scriptures witness of him, both that he is Man—and that he is the Lord the holy One,—and the mighty God.

ⁿ *Tertull. Apolog. Cap. 21. Hunc ex Deo prolatum didicimus, & prolatione generatum; & idcirco Filium Dei, & Deum dictum ex unitate substantiæ.—Ita & quod de Deo perfectum est, Deus est, & Dei Filius, & unus ambo.*

° iii. 11. 8. Aliud enim (sc. Evangelium) illam quæ est à Patre, principalem, & efficabilem, & gloriosam Generationem ejus enarrat, dicens sic: *In principio erat Verbum, &c. Joan. i. 1, &c.*

P Ibid. 19. 2. —Quoniam præclaram præter omnes habuit in se eam, quæ est ab altissimo Patre, genituram, præclara autem functus est & eâ, quæ ex Virgine, generatione; utraque Scripturæ Divinæ de eo testificantur; & quoniam homo—& quoniam Dominus Sanctus,—& Deus fortis.—

3. q “The

3. 9 “ The Prophet saith concerning him :
 “ *Who shall declare his Generation ?* Isa. liii. 8.
 “ But you (Heretics) guessing at his Generati-
 “ on of the Father, and transferring the Pro-
 “ lation from the Word of Men made by the
 “ Tongue to the Word of God, witness against
 “ your selves, that you understand neither hu-
 “ man nor divine Things.—If any one ask
 “ us, How then was the Son brought forth
 “ by the Father ? We answer, that this Pro-
 “ lation or Generation,—or however else you
 “ express his Generation, which is indeed in-
 “ effable ; it is understood by none, neither
 “ *Valentinus*, nor *Marcion*, nor *Saturninus*, nor
 “ *Basilides* ; no, nor by the Angels, nor Arch-
 “ angels, nor Principalities, nor Powers ; but by
 “ the Father only which begat, and by the Son,
 “ which is begotten of him. Wherefore, since
 “ his Generation is unspeakable, they that en-
 “ deavour to declare the Generations and Prola-
 “ tions, know not what they do, undertaking
 “ to give an account of things unaccountable.”

9 ii. 28. 5. Et Propheta quidem ait de eo : *Generationem ejus quis enarrabit ?* Vos autem generationem ejus ex Patre divinantes, & verbi hominum per linguam factam prolationem transferentes in Verbum Dei, justè detegimini à vobis ipsis, quod neque humana, nec divina noveritis. Et N^o. 6.— Si quis itaque nobis dixerit : Quomodo ergo Filius prolatus à Patre est ? Dicimus ei, quia prolationem istam, sive generationem, — aut quolibet quis nomine vocaverit generationem ejus inenarrabilem existentem, nemo novit ; non *Valentinus*, non *Marcion*, neque *Saturninus*, neque *Basilides*, neque Angeli, neque Archangeli, neque Principes, neque Potestates, nisi solus qui generavit Pater, & qui natus est Filius. Inenarrabilis itaque generatio ejus cum sit, quicumque nituntur Generationes & Prolationes enarrare, non sunt compotes sui, ea quæ inenarrabilia sunt enarrare promittentes.

II. *Prop.* This Generation of the Son was from all Eternity, without beginning; and consequently he is consubstantial, and co-eternal with the Father.

i. ^r “ The Heretics say, the *Word* was spoken forth by the *Mind*: which every Body knows may well enough be apply’d to the Case of Men speaking their *Mind*: But there cannot be any Emission in this Order, in the supreme God, since he is all *Mind*, and all *Word* (*Logos*,) and has nothing in him anterior or later, or different from himself; but ever continues all uniform, similar, and perfectly one.—He that says he is all *Mind*, and all *Word*, tho’ he has but imperfect Apprehensions of the Father of all; yet has more becoming Thoughts than they that transfer the Generation of a *Word* utter’d by Men, to the eternal *Word* of God, and ascribe to him a beginning of his being spoken forth, and temporary Production, as to their own *Word*. Now wherein shall the *Word* of God, or rather God himself, since he is the *Word*, differ from the *Word* of

^r ii. 13. 8. —Dicunt à Nû esse emissum *Logon*: quod quidem omnes videlicet sciunt, quoniam in hominibus quidem consequenter dicatur; in eo autem qui sit super omnes Deus, totus Nus, & totus *Logos* cum sit.— & nec aliud antiquius, nec posterius, aut aliud alterius habente in se, sed toto æquali, & simili, & uno perseverante, jam non talis hujus ordinationis sequitur Emissio.—Qui ait totum illum sensum, (vñ) & totum Verbum,——minus quidem adhuc de Patre omnium sentiet: Decentiora autem magis quam hi, qui generationem prolative hominum Verbi transferunt in Dei æternum Verbum, & Prolationis initium donantes & genesin, quemadmodum & suo Verbo. Et in quo distabit Dei Verbum, immo magis ipse Deus, cum sit Verbum, à Verbo hominum, si eandem habuerit ordinationem & emissionem generationis?

“ Men,

“ Men, if he was generated and spoken forth
 “ in the same Manner and Order?”

Here he plainly asserts the Co-eternity and
 Consubstantiality of the Word.

i. The Co-eternity of the Son, and his beginningless Generation is fully express'd, in opposition to the Heretics. They divided the Son into as many *Æons* almost as he has Names, viz. only-begotten Son, the Word, Wisdom, Saviour, Christ, &c. They supposed, that a Series of these and others was successively produced : and the Generation of the first-begotten was antemundane, but not absolutely eternal ; and the Word had only the third place in this imaginary Series. *Irenæus* shews the absurdity of supposing a temporary Generation of the Word ; he expressly reckons it an heretical Tenet to ascribe a beginning of Generation to him, tho' supposed to precede the Creation of the World many Ages ; and we never find they presum'd to determine the precise Time or Point of Eternity, when the *Plerôma* was fill'd with *Æons*. They have unworthy Apprehensions of the incomprehensible God, who hold a temporary Generation of the eternal Word of God : The eternal Word here ($\alpha\iota\omega\iota\varsigma$ & $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$), as opposed to a beginning of Being, must signify absolutely eternal. Besides, a little before this Passage, he observes, that *Basilides* held (*initia emissionum*) Divine Generations that had a beginning, ^f borrow'd from the old *Gnostics*, intimating, that the Venom and Absurdity of his Heresy consisted in this.

^f ii. 13. 8. Hæc——similiter & adversus eos, qui à *Basilide* sunt, aptata sunt : & adversus reliquos *Gnosticos*, à quibus & hi initia emissionum accipientes, convicti sunt.——

He denies that there is any thing *prior*, or *posterior* to another in God, who is a Being perfectly simple and uncompounded ; whatsoever is in him, is God himself ; therefore to suppose, that the *Word* is posterior in Existence and Duration to the Mind of God, and that his Mind must pre-exist and conceive a Thought, and then produce the Word, is to make God prior and posterior to himself, and to bring him down to a Level with imperfect Man, who in this Order produceth his Word. This is evidently his Argument here, and in other Places. Γένεσις here signifies a *temporary Generation*, or the Production of that which once had no Being^t. The Order of Generation he finds fault with, is supposing the Mind to be pre-existent to the Conception, the Conception to the external Word, &c. And hence he exposes the absurdity of the heretical Scheme, which represented some *Æons older, and some younger*.

“ “ Were the *Æons*, saith he, emitted all at once, or successively in some Order, so that “ some of ’em are older and some later ?”—— and comparing them to so many Lights derived from the paternal Light, and to co-ëval Rays flowing from the Sun, he plainly levels his Argument against the temporary Production, and supposes they must be co-eternal, if generated of God. And how can one *Æon*, saith he, be supposed to be younger, and another elder, since there is but one Light of the whole *Plerôma* ^w ?

^t See the Dissertation at the end concerning ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος.

^u ii. 17. 2. ——— Utrum in eodem emissi sunt, ut ejusdem temporis essent sibi ; an secundum ordinem quendam, ita ut antiquiores quidam ipsorum, alii vero juniores essent ?

^w Ibid. N^o 5. Quomodo autem & junior aliquis, aut senior in ipsis *Æon* dici potest, cùm sit unum lumen totius Pleromatis ? ———

2. The Consubstantiality (τὸ ὁμοούσιον) of the Son is set forth in strong Expressions. The Word is God himself; *the Word of God*, saith he, *or rather God himself, since he is the Word*. —He asserts the perfect Simplicity of the Divine Being: there is nothing in God different from himself; so that his λόγος, or Word begotten of him must be of the same Essence and Nature. He often inculcates this Doctrine in parallel Passages:— * “ God is not like Men, “ saith he, neither are his Thoughts as Mens “ Thoughts: For the Father of all is far removed from human Affections and Passions: He “ is simple, uncompounded, and uniform in “ his Essence; and all that is in him is like “ himself; since he is all Mind, and all Spirit, &c.

Again: † “ Since God is all Mind, and all “ Word, what he conceives in his Mind, is the “ same that he speaks forth, and what he speaks “ forth, is the same that he conceives. For “ his Conception is his Word, and his Word “ is his Mind, and the all-containing Mind is the “ Father himself.

It plainly follows, that the Word (or λόγος) who is in the Father, and ineffably begotten

* ii. 13, 3. —Non sic Deus, quemadmodum homines; & non sic cogitationes ejus, quomodo cogitationes hominum. Multum enim distat omnium Pater ab his, quæ proveniunt hominibus, affectionibus & passionibus: & simplex, & non compositus, & similibus, & totus ipse sibi similis, & æqualis est; totus cum sensus (νῆς) & totus spiritus, &c.

† ii. 28, 5. Deus autem totus existens mens, & totus existens Logos, quod cogitat, hoc & loquitur; & quod loquitur, hoc & cogitat. Cogitatio enim ejus Logos, & Logos Mens, & omnia concludens Mens, ipse est Pater, —

of him, is God himself, *i. e.* of the same Nature and Essence with the Father: this Consequence is expressly owned by *Irenæus* himself in very plain Words: ^z “The Father of all, “ says he, is not, as a compounded Animal, “ something different from his Mind; —but “ the Father is Mind, and the Mind is the Father. Therefore it necessarily follows, that “ the Word (λογος) which is of him, or rather the Mind it self, since it is the Word, “ is perfect and impassible.——

Again: ^a “ If the Word existing in the Father knows at all, he is not ignorant of him “ in whom he is; that is, of himself.——

The Word then is not in Essence different from the Father, but so ineffably one with him, that he may be said to be the *Father himself*.

Now if any one object, that in these Passages *Irenæus* speaks of the *Internal Reason*, or *Word* of God, but has no reference to the *personal Word*, who is begotten of him; I answer; 'tis undeniably plain, he speaks of the Word, which was spoken forth, and ineffably generated; and this is not the internal Reason, but the Son of God.—A little after one of the cited Passages, ^b “ He that assigns, saith he,

^z ii. 17. 7. Non enim ut compositum animal quiddam est omnium Pater, præter Nun;——Sed Nus Pater, & Pater Nus. Necessè itaq; est & eum, qui ex eo est Logos, immo magis autem ipsum Nun, cum sit Logos, perfectum & impassibilem esse.——

^a Ibid. 8. ——Si enim existens in Patre (Logos) cognoscit, hunc in quo est, hoc est semetipsum non ignorat.

^b ii. 28, 5. ——Similiter autem rursus & de Logo tertiam prolationem ei à Patrè donans,——porro & longe Logon à Deo separavit. Et Propheta quidem ait de eo: *Generationem ejus quis enarrabit?* —si quis itaq; nobis dixerit, Quomodo ergo Filius prolatus à Patrè est? &c.

“ to

“ to the Word Generation of the Father in
 “ the third Place,—separates him from the Fa-
 “ ther at a great Distance. Now the Prophet
 “ faith concerning him : *Who shall declare his*
 “ *Generation ?*

And after he had smartly rebuked the Presumption of the Heretics in prying into, and pretending to explain this ineffable Mystery of the Generation of the Son, he subjoins the famous Passage above-cited concerning the manner of this Generation, in which he owns, it is unsearchable even to the Heavenly Intelligences ^c.

Again, between two other Passages produced also above, he has these Words : ^d “ The
 “ Word therefore, as if it were generated in
 “ the third Place, is not ignorant of the Fa-
 “ ther, as they teach : For though this may
 “ perhaps seem probable in the Generation of
 “ Men, because they oft-times know not their
 “ Parents ; yet in the Word of God it is ut-
 “ terly impossible.— ’Tis the personal, sub-
 sisting Word only that was begotten of the Father ; of which therefore he reasons, as we have seen, allowing him to be of the same Essence and Substance with the Father.

On the other hand, perhaps, some will infer, that *Irenæus* deny’d the distinct *Subsistence*, or *Personality* of the Word, supposing him to be no more than the *Reason* of the Father, and consequently was of the *Sabellian* Notion in

^c See this Passage above in Prop. 1.

^d ii. 17, 8. Non igitur jam Logos quasi tertium ordinem generationis habens ignoravit Patrem, quemadmodum docent hi : hoc enim in hominum quidem generatione fortasse putabitur verisimile esse, eò quod sæpe ignorant suos parentes ; in Logo autem Patris omnimodo impossibile est.

this Point: To which I answer; 'tis evident to a Demonstration from other Places, that he believed the Personality of the Word; nor can there be any rational doubt of it. And consequently, when he speaks of the Son, as the Father's Mind and Reason, he must be understood strongly to express the Unity of Substance, and not to confound the Persons, or to make the Son only an Attribute or Faculty. For as he held fast the *Catholic Faith*, so he had also *Catholic Modesty*, very different from the *Pride* and *Presumption* of Heretics: He seems plainly to allow, that the Doctrine of the Generation of the Son, his Union with, and yet Distinction from the Father, does far surpass the utmost Reach of human or angelic Thought: And therefore he supposed, these Expressions, *The Mind, the Reason and Word spoken forth*, not to be an *Explication*, but only an imperfect *Illustration* of this incomprehensible Mystery. For when his Thoughts and Pen were employed about this great Subject, and when he had just asserted, that all that is in God, is God himself, he adds: " Now God is above these
 " Things, and upon the Account of these
 " Things, ineffable. He may well be termed
 " the all-comprehending Mind; but is not like
 " the Mind of Men: He may also be rightly
 " called Light, but yet is not at all like our

^e ii. 13, 4. Est autem & super hæc, & propter hæc inenarrabilis. Sensus enim capax omnium bene & recte dicitur, sed non similis hominum sensui: & Lumen rectissime dicitur, sed nihil simile ei, quod est secundum nos, lumini. Sic autem & in reliquis omnibus nulli similis erit omnium Pater hominum pusillitati: & dicitur quidem secundum hæc propter dilectionem, sentitur autem super hæc secundum magnitudinem.

“ Light.

“ Light. And so in all other Things the Father
 “ of all is not like poor imperfect Men : He
 “ is expressed and represented by these Things
 “ in a way of Condescension ; but is under-
 “ stood far to surpass them in transcendent
 “ Greatness. The Son then is termed the Fa-
 “ ther’s *Reason and Word*, not that he is only an
 internal Faculty, or an Expression of inward
 Conceptions ; but to give us an Adumbration
 of his ineffable Unity and Coessentiality with
 the Father.

But I return to give farther Proofs of the
 Son’s being of the same Substance with the
 Father : And if we consider his Reasonings a-
 gainst the *Valentinians*, chiefly in the 17th Chap.
 of the 2^d Book, we shall find it was a Prin-
 ciple with him, that,

“ On Supposition of Generation in God, that
 “ which is begotten must be consubstantial, or
 “ of the same Essence with the Father.

For to prove the Absurdity of that Part of
 their Scheme, in which the generated *Æons*
 were all, except the *Only-begotten*, supposed
 capable of Ignorance and Passion, he assumes
 the intermediate Idea of Consubstantiality ; and
 argues to this Effect, “ The *Æons*, as begotten
 “ of the Supreme Father, must have the same
 “ Nature, Substance, or Essence with him ;
 “ and consequently must be incapable of Im-
 “ perfection, Ignorance, and Passion ; for these
 “ are incompatible to the Divine Substance,
 “ which sustains the Qualities and Attri-
 “ butes.

† “ If the *Æons* be supposed to be generated,
 “ so

† ii. 17, 3. Sed si quidem efficaciliter & secundum suam
 genescin unusquisq; illorum (Æonum) emissus est secundum
 hominum

“ so as to have a separate Existence, as the
 “ Individuals of Mankind, then those that are
 “ begotten, must either be consubstantial to
 “ the Father, and so like him that begat
 “ ’em; or if they appear to be unlike him, it
 “ must be own’d, that they are of some other
 “ Substance.

Note, This later he mentions as an Absurdity, to which the supposed Impertection and Unlikeness of the *Æons* did necessarily lead, tho’ inconsistent with divine Generation, and probably disown’d by the Heretics themselves.

Again: § “ But if the *Æons* were derived
 “ from the *Word*, and the *Word* from the
 “ *Mind*, and the *Mind* from *Bythus*, as one
 “ Light from another—they may perhaps
 “ differ from one another in their Derivation
 “ and Greatness: but since they are of the same
 “ Substance with him, from whom they are
 “ originally derived, either they must all remain impassible, or the Father himself must
 “ also partake of Passion. —Or if any one
 “ should call them Stars, they shall all nevertheless have the same common Nature. For
 “ tho’ one Star differ from another in Glory,
 “ 1 Cor.

hominum similitudinem; vel generationes Patris erunt ejusdem Substantiæ ei, & similes Generatori; (Gr. forte, ἡ γενήματα τῷ πατρὶ ἐκείνῳ ὁμοῦσια αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁμοία γενήσασθαι) vel si dissimiles parebunt, ex alterâ quâdam substantiâ confiteri eos esse necesse est.

§ ii. 17. 4. Si autem, velut à lumine lumina accensa, sunt *Æones* à *Logo*, *Logos* autem à *Nû*, & *Nus* à *Bytho*; — generatione quidem & magnitudine fortasse distabunt ab invicem: ejusdem autem Substantiæ cum sint cum Principe emissionis ipsorum, aut omnes impassibiles perseverant, aut & Pater ipsorum participabit passiones. — Sect. 5. — Et si quis Stellas dicat eos, nihilo minus eâdem universi apparebunt naturâ parti-

“ 1 *Cor.* xv. 41. yet not in Quality or Substance,
 “ by which any thing is passible or impassible.
 “ But since they are all from the paternal Light,
 “ they must needs either be all naturally impassible and unchangeable ; or else all with the
 “ paternal Light it self be passible and capable
 “ of corrupting Changes.

Again: § “ If they say, their *Æons* were derived, as Rays from the Sun, since they are
 “ all Consubstantial, and from the same Fountain, they must either all be capable of Passion with him, from whom they are derived,
 “ or all, one as well as another, continue impassible.”

From these Passages I would observe,

1. That probably *Irenæus* used the Word *ὁμοῦσι*®, *Consubstantial*, that was so famous afterwards in the Controversy between the Catholics and the *Arians*. For where the Greek is preserved, we find *ὁμοῦσι*® is the Word that is rendered, as here, *eiusdem Substantiæ, of the same Substance* ^h. *Tertullian* renders it by *Consubstantivus* ⁱ. And perhaps *Irenæus* was one of those

participantes. Etenim si *Stella a Stella in claritate differt* ; sed non secundum qualitatem, nec secundum substantiam, secundum quam passibile aliquid vel impassibile est ; sed aut universos, ex Lumine cum sint paterno, naturaliter impassibiles & immutabiles esse oportet : aut universi cum paterno lumine, & passibiles, & commutationum corruptionis capaces sunt.

§ Ibid. 7. Si autem, quomodo à Sole Radios, *Æonas* ipsorum emissiones habuisse dicent, *eiusdem Substantiæ* & de eodem omnes cum sint, aut omnes capaces passionis erunt cum eo, qui ipsos emisit, aut omnes impassibiles perseverabunt.

^h 1. 5. 1. —Τὸ μὲν πνευματικὸν μὴ διδόνῃσθαι αὐτῇ (L. αὐτὴν) μορφῶσαι, ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁμοῦσιον ὑπῆρχεν αὐτῇ. —Spiritale quidem non potuisse eam formare, quoniam *eiusdem Substantiæ* ei erat.—& postea.—Βασιλεὺς πάντων, τῶν τε ὁμοῦσιων αὐτῇ.—Regem omnium *eiusdem Substantiæ* ei, &c.

ⁱ *Tertullian.* adv. *Valent.* c. 18. Ferè enim paria & consubstantiva, in alterutrum valere Societas Naturæ negavit.

Ancients who used the term ὁμοῦσι[Ⓢ] concerning the Father and the Son, as *Eusebius* witnesseth in his Epistle concerning the Decisions of the Council of *Nice* ^k. For tho' he does not *directly* assert the Son's being of the same Substance with the Father, he does it *consequently*. But if the *Greek* here was, τῆς αὐτῆς ἐσίας, as *Billius* conjectures, the Sense is the very same; for the Doctrine of the Consubstantiality was often so express'd about, and after the time of the *Nicene* Council ^l.

2. He explains the Sense of the Word ὁμοῦσι[Ⓢ], or *consubstantial*, by Communion in the same Nature, *eâdem naturâ participantibus*, having the same common Nature: And it is such a Sameness of Substance or Nature, as necessarily infers all the same essential Properties: For he concludes, from the Consubstantiality of the *Æons*, that they must be incapable of Imperfections; such as Ignorance, Passion, Changes, &c.

And this he illustrates by the Comparisons of one Lamp lighted by another, and of the Rays streaming forth from the Sun; which the Orthodox Fathers also use as some imperfect Resemblances of the ineffable Generation of the Son.

^k Apud Socrat. H. E. 1. 8. — Ἐπεὶ καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν τινὰς λογίμους καὶ ἐπιφανεῖς ἐπισκόπους καὶ συγγραφεῖας, ἔγνωμεν ἐπὶ τῆς τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ θεολογίας, τῷ τῷ ὁμοῦσι συγχεσθαι ὁνόματι.

^l Sozom. E. H. L. 2. C. 21. de Eusebio & Theognio — εἰς τὸ φανερὸν ἐπεχείρουν διδάσκειν, μὴ χεῖναι ὁμοῦσιον εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τῷ πατρὶ δοξάζειν & ostensâ suâ veste, dixit Eusebius, εἰ τοῦτο τὸ ἱμάτιον ἐμοῦ θεωρῶντας διαγινώσκουσιν, ἔποτε ἂν φαίνοι τὴν αὐτῆς ἐσίας ἐκότερον.

— L. 4. C. 28. De Meletio — ἀναφανθὼν τὴν αὐτῆς ἐσίας τῷ πατρὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἀπεφάνητο.

— Theodoret. H. E. L. 1. C. 2. De Alexandro Alexandrino. — ὁμότιμον ἔλεγε τοῦ πατρὸς τὸν υἱόν, καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐσίαν ἔχειν τῷ γεγεννημένῳ Θεῷ.

3. As

3. As Consubstantiality is the necessary Consequence of Divine Generation, as understood by the *Ante-nicene* Fathers ; so the Word does not determine, whether the Identity of Substance be *numerical* or *specific*al : Nor does it appear to me, that ever the Fathers enter'd into this Enquiry : They look'd upon the *Unity* and *Distinction* of the Father and Son, as incomprehensible : That the Son as God had the Nature and Substance of God, as in order to be true Man, he assum'd the Nature and Substance of Man, they firmly believ'd ; but durst not measure God by our low Idea's borrow'd from the Individuals of any Species among Creatures ; these secret things they left to the Lord, and were content with what God had revealed in Scripture. They held indeed, that the Son was not ταυτοῦσις, *of the same Essence*, in the *Sabellian Sense*, which destroy'd the Distinction of Persons, and also that he was not ἑτεροῦσις, as the *Arians* held, which amounted to a Denial of his Godhead. The Catholic Medium equally avoided both these Extremes, as being subversive of the Notion of true Generation ; for if there be no Distinction of Persons, 'tis plain, there can be no Generation : and on the other hand, if there was not a Communication of the same Nature, it was not Generation, but Creation.

4. When *Irenæus* seems to allow, that the *Æons*, tho' consubstantial with the Father, and one another, might differ with respect to Greatness and Glory, as Stars do, it ought not to be infer'd, that he supposed a real Inequality in the consubstantial Trinity. For, as his Adversaries supposed such an Inequality among their consubstantial *Æons*, he only waves that part of the

M

Dispute,

Dispute, which was not then to his Purpose, as is usual in Controversies, and carries his Argument no farther than his Scope required, and the Simile he uses would bear : For there are greater and lesser Lights, and *one Star differs from another in Glory*. And he here yields in the same manner the temporary and successive Derivation of Light from Light^m; which yet he elsewhere strenuously opposes in the Case of the eternal Word of God.

III. *Prop.* The Son by his Generation had not a separate Existence from the Father, nor are the two Persons two separate Beings, like the several Individuals of the human Species; but they are ineffably united, the Son being in the Father, and the Father in the Son.

ⁿ “ Were the *Æons* united to him that emitted ’em, as the Rays and the Sun ; or were they generated by way of Division, so that they exist separately in their proper Forms, as particular Men, and other Animals do ?

° “ If they were thus produced, — they must be supposed to be entirely separate from
“ one

^m ii. 17. 4. Neque enim quæ postea accensa est Facula, alterum lumen habebit, quam illud quod ante eam fuit. — Et postea: Quod autem juvenius est, & antiquius, neque in ipso lumine intelligi potest. — sed tantum secundum accensionem, quoniam altera quidem ante pusillum tempus, altera autem nunc accensa est.

ⁿ Ibid. 17. 2. Quæritur igitur, quemadmodum emissi sunt reliqui *Æones* ? utrum uniti ei qui emisit, quemadmodum à Sole Radii, an efficaciliter & partiliter, uti sit unusquisque eorum separatim, & suam figurationem habens, quemadmodum ab homine homo, & à pecude pecus ?

° Ibid. 3. Sed si quidem efficaciliter, & secundum suam genesin unusquisque illorum emissus est secundum hominum simili-

“ one another, as so many Men are, without
 “ any close Union.”——

Tho’ the Rays flow from the Sun as their Fountain, yet they so necessarily co-exist, that ’tis impossible for ’em to have a separate Existence. And if the Son was so incomprehensibly begotten of the Father, as to admit of this Illustration, it follows according to *Irenæus*, that the Father and Son have not, cannot have such a distinct Being and separate Existence, as two individual Men. Besides, if he reckoned it a great Absurdity in the *Valentinian* Scheme, that their *Æons*, held by them to be generated of God, should be supposed to have such a distinct and separate Existence, much more would he have thought it Blasphemy to assert this concerning the Son, who has the same Essence with the Father, and is so ineffably *one* with him, that he may be said to be the *Father himself*.

And this seems to lead us to the true Method, the Ancients took to explain the Unity of God, in consistence with the Distinction of Persons, and the true Godhead of the Son and Holy Ghost. As the Sun and its Rays make not two Suns, because the Rays necessarily stream from the Sun, and don’t make a distinct luminous Body; so the Father and Son are not two Gods, because the Son had not a separate Existence of himself, but proceeded from the Father by eternal Generation, and naturally and necessarily subsists in, and with him in the strictest Union. In this Sense only they refer the Unity to the Father: Had the Son and Holy

similitudinem; —— secundum hanc rationem unusquisque eorum separatim divisus ab altero intelligetur, quemadmodum homines, non admixtus, nec unitus alter altero.—

Spirit been two *eternal Minds*, not proceeding from the Father, they could not according to their Principles have sav'd the Unity. But because there is but one Fountain of the Deity, and the Son and Spirit in their distinct Personality did not exist of themselves, but were of the Father's Substance by Generation and Procession, they cannot exist separately to make so many Gods, but naturally remain ineffably united, and one God with him.

The Principle into which his Argument here is resolv'd, he applies elsewhere to the Son, by asserting his ineffable Union with the Father.

P " By the Son, who is in the Father, and
" hath the Father in him, the God that truly
" is, is manifested.

Q Again: " Not only before *Adam*, but be-
" fore any thing was created, the Word glo-
" rify'd his Father, *abiding in him*, and himself
" was glorify'd by the Father."

P iii. 6. 2. Per Filium itaque, qui est in Patre, & habet in se Patrem, is qui est, manifestatus est Deus.

Q iv. 14. 1. Non enim solum ante *Adam*, sed & ante omnem conditionem glorificabat Verbum Patrem suum, manens in eo; & ipse à Patre clarificabatur. —

C H A P. VI.

The Passages of Scripture understood by Irenæus concerning Christ, which prove his Belief of his Deity.

1. ^a “ **I**T is not probable, that one made the
 “ Body, and another formed the
 “ Eyes; but the very same that created *Adam*
 “ from the beginning,—manifesting himself to
 “ Men in the later Days, formed the Sight of
 “ him that was blind from *Adam*. Where-
 “ fore the Scripture hinting at something fu-
 “ ture, says, when *Adam* hid himself upon ac-
 “ count of his Disobedience, the Lord came
 “ to him in the Evening, and called him, say-
 “ ing, *Where art thou?* Gen. iii. 9. Which
 “ implies, that the same Word of God would
 “ come in the last Days to call Man.—

2. ^b “ At the Overthrow of the *Sodomites*,
 “ the Scripture saith; *And the Lord rained on*
 “ *Sodom and Gomorrah Fire and Brimstone*
 “ *from the Lord out of Heaven*, Gen. xix. 24.
 Inti-

^a v. 15. 4. — Nec consequens est alterum quidem Cor-
 pus, alterum vero plasmasse oculos: Sed idem-ipse qui ab
 initio plasmavit *Adam*.—in novissimis temporibus semetip-
 sum manifestans hominibus, ei qui ab *Adam* cæcus erat, for-
 mavit visionem. Et propter hoc Scriptura significans quod
 futurum erat, ait, abscondito *Adam* propter inobedientiam,
 Dominum venisse vespere ad eum, & evocasse eum, & dixisse
 ei: *Ubi es?* hoc est, quoniam in novissimis temporibus idip-
 sum venit Verbum Dei advocare hominem.—

^b iii. 6. 1. Et iterum, in everfione Sodomitarum scrip-
 tura ait: *Et pluit Dominus super Sodomam & Gomorrhā*
ignem & sulfur a Domino de Cælo. Filium enim hic signi-
 ficat,

“ Intimating, that the Son, who also conversed with *Abraham*, received Power from the Father to judge the *Sodomites* for their Iniquity.”

This is an Instance of the Son, as well as the Father's being absolutely stiled *Lord* in Scripture; which to *Irenæus* was an Evidence of his true Godhead and supreme Dominion. He intimates also, that he appeared as one of the three Angels, who is called *Jehova*, and with whom *Abraham* interceded for *Sodom*, Gen. xviii.—compare *Job*. v. 22.

3. ^c “ The Son speaking to *Moses*, saith ;
“ *I am come down to deliver this People*, *Exod.*
“ iii. 8. For 'tis he that descends and ascends
“ for the Salvation of Men.

4. ^d “ *Deut.* xxxii. 6. *Do ye thus requite*
“ *the Lord, O foolish People and unwise ? Is not*
“ *he thy Father that possess'd thee, that made and*
“ *created thee ?*

Again: “ The Father of Mankind is the
“ Word of God ; as *Moses* has shew'd in these
“ Words : *Is not he thy Father that possess'd*
“ *thee ? &c.*

ficat, qui & *Abrahæ* colloquutus sit, à Patre accepisse potestatem ad judicandum *Sodomitas*, propter iniquitatem eorum.

^c Ibid. 2. —Et iterum, loquente Filio ad *Moysem* ; *Descendi*, inquit, *eripere populum hunc*. Ipse est enim qui descendit, & ascendit propter salutem hominum.

^d iv. 10. 2. Quapropter *Moyse*s increpans populum, —ait : *Sic populus fatuus, & non Sapiens, hæc Domino retribuistis ?* —Et iterum : *nonne hic idem Pater tuus possedit te, & fecit te, & creavit te ?*

Et Cap. 31. 2. Pater autem generis humani Verbum Dei : quemadmodum *Moyse*s ostendit, dicens : *nonne hic ipse Pater tuus possedit te, & fecit te, & creavit te ?*

5. ^c “ They

5. ^e “ They who call upon the Principalities in Heaven to open the everlasting Gates, that the King of Glory may enter, preached Christ’s Resurrection—and his Ascension to Heaven.”

Christ is the King of Glory described, *Psal.* xxiv. where he is stiled *Jehova, the mighty God, the Lord of Hosts*; which are some of the peculiar, and greatest Titles of the God of *Israel*.

6. ^f “ *Psal.* xlv. 7, 8. *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever; a Scepter of Righteousness is the Scepter of thy Kingdom. Thou hast loved Righteousness, and hated Iniquity; therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee.*

7. ^g “ The Church is the Synagogue of God; which God, that is, the Son himself gather’d by himself (in Person.) Of whom he saith again. *The God of Gods the Lord hath spoken, and called the Earth. What God? he of whom he said: God shall visibly come, even our God, and will not be silent; that is, the Son, &c.*”

These two last Texts are produced as Proofs, that the Son is truly God and Lord, because so stiled absolutely in Scripture; and can any one suppose that *Irenæus* took him to be a Creature or inferior God, who speaks with such Majesty, and assumes such great Titles in the 50th *Psal*m?

^e iv. 33. 13. —Et præcipientes principibus Cælorum, aperire æternas portas, ut introeat Rex Gloriæ, resurrectionem ejus, — & receptionem in Cælos præconaverunt.

^f iii. 6. 1. Sedes tua, Deus, in æternum; Virga directionis, &c.

^g Ibid. —Hæc enim (Ecclesia) est Synagoga Dei, quam Deus, hoc est, Filius ipse per semetipsum collegit. De quo iterum dicit: *Deus Deorum Dominus loquutus est, & vocavit terram. Quis Deus? de quo dixit: Deus manifeste venit, Deus noster, & non filebit: — hoc est, Filius, &c.*

The Son then is *Jehova*, our God, the God of Gods, the most High, who is Possessor of Heaven and Earth, to whom the Israelites offer'd their Sacrifices, &c. Let the Reader look over the whole *Psalms*, and judge whether any serious Person could possibly believe, that he who is spoken of, and speaks in such a lofty Strain, was but a Creature, or any one less than the most High God. I'm sure, if he be not the supreme God, who is here describ'd, we may despair to find him in the Old Testament. Ascribing these high Characters to an inferior Being, would give some Countenance to the old Heretics, that deny'd the God of the *Jews*, and blasphemously asserted, that partly thro' Ignorance, partly thro' Vanity he assum'd those Characters that belong'd not to him. 'Tis observable, that the Fathers did not conclude, that a Divine Person spoken of in the Old Testament, was not the Son, but the Father, because of the high Characters ascribed to him: They made no difference in this respect: But if they found in the Context any Indications, that it was a Person, who was wont to converse with Men that was to come visibly, or to be the Judge of the World, &c. they understood the Text of the Son, tho' describ'd under never so glorious Characters and Titles, as *Jehova*, the Lord of Hosts, the God of Gods, the most High, the Holy one and God of Israel, the Living and true God, besides whom there is no God, &c. Can any one, that knows the Spirit of *Arianism*, suspect 'em to have been in the least tinctur'd with it?

8. ^h “ The Word, the Maker of all things,
“ who

^h iii. 11. 8. Ὁ τῶν ἀπάντων τεχνίτης λόγος, ὁ καθέμενος ἐπὶ τῶν

“ who sits upon the Cherubim, and upholds all
 “ things, when manifested to Men, gave us a
 “ fourfold Gospel, endited by one Spirit. Even
 “ as *David* praying for his coming, saith; *Thou*
 “ *that sittest upon the Cherubim, appear*, Pf. lxxx. i.
 9. ⁱ Pfal. lxxxii. i. “ *God stood in the As-*
 “ *sembly of the Gods, &c.*

I have had occasion above to observe, that *Irenæus* understood this, and also the 76th Psalm, *God is made known in Judah, &c.* concerning our blessed Lord, in both which he is spoken of as the God of *Israel*, and stiled ὁ Θεός, God with the Article, without any possible reference to what preceded, because he is so stiled in the beginning of these Psalms.

10. ^k Pfal. xcix. i. *The Lord reigned, let the People rage, he that sitteth upon the Cherubim (reigned,) let the Earth be moved.*

The whole Psalm must necessarily be understood of the supreme God, the God of *Israel*, who, as it follows there, *is great in Zion, and whose great and terrible Name is to be praised, &c.*

11. ⁱ Isa. vii. 14. *Behold, a Virgin shall conceive, and bring forth a Son, and ye shall call his*
Name

τῶν χειρῶν, καὶ συνέχων τὰ πάντα, φανερωθεὶς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τετραμέρονον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἐν ᾧ πνεύματι συνεχομένοι κατὰς ὁ Δαβὶδ αἰτήμενοι αὐτῇ τὴν παρυσίαν, φησὶν ὁ καθήμι-
 10. ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν. ἐμφάνη.

ⁱ Ibid. 6. 1. ὁ Θεὸς ἔσθ' ἐν συναγωγῇ θεῶν, ἐν μέσῳ ᾧ θεὸς διακρινεῖ. & Pfal. xcvi. i. γνωστὸς ἐν τῇ Ἰσραὴλ ὁ Θεός, ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ μέγα τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. L. 4. 33. 11.

^k iv. 33. 13. Et qui dicebant: Dominus regnavit, irascantur populi, qui sedet super Cherubim, commoveatur terra; partim eam, quæ post assumptionem ejus facta est super eos qui in eum crediderunt, iram— & motum— adversus Ecclesiam prophetabant, &c.

ⁱ iii. 21. 4. Ecce, Virgo in ventre accipiet, & pariet Filium, & vocabitis nomen ejus Emmanuël, &c Diligenter igitur sig-
 N nificavit

Name Emmanuel, &c. “ The Holy Ghost has
 “ plainly signified his Birth of the Virgin, and
 “ his Substance, viz. that he is God : (for so
 “ the Name *Emmanuel* signifies) and shews,
 “ that he is Man, by saying; *Butter and Honey*
 “ *shall be eat.*——But that *he should not consent*
 “ *to Wickedness, that he might chuse the Good,*
 “ is his peculiar as God.”——

12. ^m Isa. viii. 3,——9. 6. *I went unto the*
Prophets, and she brought forth a Son, and his
Name is called Wonderful Counsellor, the Mighty
God.

See above, Chap. IV. No 5, and the Note
 upon it. Since I writ *That*, I have had a Suspi-
 cion, that the true Version of the later part of
 that famous Text, *Isa. ix. 6.* being put in the
 Margin of the vulgar Translation of the LXX.
 either from better Copies or the original *He-*
brew, might happen to creep into the Text out
 of its proper Place, as perhaps, Chap. viii. 3.
 which may be the reason of *Ireneus's* joining
 the two Texts, as here. And *Clement of Alex-*
andria seems to have produced the two Parts
 of that Verse from different Places in the Pro-
 phet. “ *The Spirit*, saith he, calls the Lord
 “ himself a Child, giving forth this Oracle by
 “ *Isaiah: Behold to us a Child is born, and unto*
 “ *us a Son is given; whose Government* (Gr. Prin-

nificavit Spiritus Sanctus.——generationem ejus, quæ est
 ex Virgine, & substantiam, quoniam Deus: (*Emmanuel* enim
 nomen hoc significat) & manifestat, quoniam homo, in eo
 quod dicit: *Butyrum & mel manducabit.*——Quod autem
non consentiet nequitiae, ut eligat bonum, proprium hoc est
 Dei, &c. Tertull. de Anima, c. 41. Solus enim Deus sine
 peccato, & solus homo sine peccato Christus, quia & Deus
 Christus.

^m iv. 33. 11. ——Veni ad Prophetam, & peperit Filium,
 & vocatur nomen ejus Admirabilis, Consiliarius, Deus, Fortis,
 “ *cipality*)

“ cipation) is upon his Shoulder, and his Name is
 “ called the Angel of great Counsel. Who is
 “ then the Infant Child? he, after whose Image
 “ we are Infants. By the same Prophet he de-
 “ clares his Greatness: *Wonderful Counsellor, the*
 “ *Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince*
 “ *of Peace.*—O the great God! O the per-
 “ fect Child! The Son in the Father, and the
 “ Father in the Son.” “Tis plain this was
 not taken from the other Greek Versions, for
 neither *Aquila*, *Theodotion*, nor *Symmachus* had
 Θεὸς ἰσχυρὸς, or δυναστὴς in their Versions.

13. “ Neither shall we look for another
 “ Christ and Son of God, but him, who was
 “ born of the Virgin *Mary*, and suffered, whom
 “ also we believe in, and love; as *Esaïas* saith:
 “ *And they shall say in that Day: Behold, the*
 “ *Lord our God, in whom we hoped, and re-*
 “ *joiced in our Salvation,* Isa. xxv. 9.

14. “ Behold, our God executes Judg-
 “ ment, and will execute it; *himself will come,*

“ Clem. Alex. Pædag. L. i. Cap. 5. p. 112. Ed. Oxon. ὃ κύριον
 αὐτὸν ὀνομάζει παιδίον, τοῦτο δὲ Ἡσαΐας θεωρεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα. Ἰδὲ
 παιδίον ἐγεννήθη ἡμῖν υἱὸς καὶ ἐδόθη ἡμῖν, ἃ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐπὶ τῷ ἁμῶς
 αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ μεγάλης βελῆς ἀγγελῶν. ἢ ἐν
 τῷ παιδίῳ τὸ νήπιον· οὐ κατ’ εἰκόνα ἡμεῖς οἱ νήπιοι. Διὰ τοῦ αὐ-
 τοῦ προφητῆς διηγείται τὸ μέγεθος αὐτοῦ. Θαυμαστὸς σύμβουλῶν,
 Θεὸς δυναστὴς, πατὴρ αἰώνιῶν, ἀρχὼν εἰρήνης. — ὁ τοῦ μεγάλου
 Θεοῦ ὁ τοῦ τελείου παιδὸς κ. τ. ε.

“ iv. 9. 2. — Neque alium Christum, & Dei Filium ex-
 pectabimus; sed hunc, qui ex *Maria* Virgine, qui & passus
 est, in quem & credimus, quem & diligimus; quemadmodum
Esaïas ait. Et dicent in illa die: ecce, Dominus Deus noster,
 in quem speravimus, & exultavimus in salute nostra.

“ iii. 20. 3. Propter hoc ergo signum salutis nostræ eum,
 qui est ex Virgine *Emmanuel*, est ipse Dominus — hoc
 autem & *Esaïas*: — Ecce, Deus noster judicium retribuit,
 & retributurus est: ipse veniet, & salvabit nos. V. etiam
 Lib. 4. C. 33. 11.

“ or he will come himself, and save us, *Isa.*

“ xxxv. 4.

15. 9 “ Again: That it was neither a mere
“ Man that saves us, nor yet without Flesh
“ (for the Angels are without Flesh) he has de-
“ clared, saying: *Neither an Elder* (Gr. Amba-
“ sador,) *nor an Angel; but the Lord himself*
“ *shall save them; because he loves them, and will*
“ *spare them, himself shall redeem them,* ch. lxi. 9.

The learned Dr. *Allix*^r suspects, that the LXX. whose Version *Irenæus* follows, read in this Text of the Prophet *Isaiab*, לא שר not a Prince or Angel, instead of לא צר as we now have it in all the Copies. But there is no ground to suppose, that their unpointed Copy differ'd in the least from ours; only they joined the later part of the preceding Verse with this, and by their way of pointing and distinguishing, render'd it thus: *And he became their Saviour out of all their Affliction; not a Messenger* (Heb. "לא צִר צִיר ק" nor Angel; (but) himself, or the Lord himself, according to *Irenæus* and the *Alexandrian MS.* [*Heb.* his Face, i.e. himself in Person, as *Exod.* xxxiii. 14. פני ילכו my Face, we render it, my Presence shall go with thee; but the LXX, Ὁ αὐτὸς παρρησέσσομαι ες, I my self will go before thee; compare 2 *Sam.* xvii. 11. "ופניך הלכים וגו' and that thou go to Battel in thine own Person] saved them, &c. They read לא as the Text still has it, and not according to the critical Note of the *Masorites*, called

⁹ iii. 20. 4. Rursus, quoniam neque homo tantum erit, qui salvat nos, neque sine carne, (sine carne enim Angeli sunt) prædicavit enim dicens: neque Senior, neque Angelus, sed ipse Dominus salvabit eos, quoniam diligit eos, & parcet eis, ipse liberabit eos.

^r Judgment of the *Jewish Church*, chap. 8. p. 109.

the *Keri*; and so did the *Chaldee* Paraphrast and the antient *Syriac* Interpreter; and *R. D. Kimchi* gives the Sense both according to the textual and marginal Reading. *V. Com. in locum.*

And צר they read not with a *Camets*, as now, but with the long *Chirec*, which frequently has not (י) צר for ציר that is a Messenger, *Gr.* πρέσβυς, it should rather have been πρέσβις, as perhaps the famous Interpreters left it, and hence the *Alexandrian* MS. has πρέσβυς. But tho' πρέσβυς is tolerable, it gave occasion to the *Latin* Interpreter to mistake the Sense, and render it *Senior*, an *Elder*. And so *Cyprian* also has it^f; but *Tertullian* has render'd it *Legatus*, a *Messenger*^g. And finally, they did not construe מלאך and פנים together, for the *Angel of his Face*, or *Presence*, but separated 'em, and supposed the later to signify *God himself*, in opposition to any inferior Agent, as I have represented above.

This I take to be a good Proof, that the antient *Jews* believed, that the Divine Person, called the *Word of God*, the *Shechinah*, the *Angel of his Face*, &c. that deliver'd their Ancestors out of *Egypt*, was not a created Angel, but the *Lord himself*. A Passage of this Import is found in the *Jerusalem Talmud*; where their antient Doctors say: "*When the merciful God came to deliver his People out of Egypt, he did not*

^f Testimon. adv. Judæos. ii. 7. p. 36. Ed. Oxon.—Non Senior, neque Angelus; sed ipse Dominus liberabit illos, &c.

^g Adv. Marcion. iv. 22. Non legatus, inquit *Esaias*, nec nuntius, sed ipse Dominus salvos eos fecit. v. etiam Lib. de carne Christi, c. 14.

^h Talmud Hierosol. Horajoth, Cap. 3. apud Buxtorfium Lex. Chal. in voce מלאך Quando Deus misericors venit ad liberandum *Israelem* ex *Egypto*, non misit Legatum vel Angelum, sed Deus Benedictus ipsemet venit, &c.

send a Messenger or Angel; but the blessed God himself came, &c. And Jonathan interprets this Text in Chaldee of the Word; and his Word, saith he, became their Redeemer, &c.

But I insert this Text to express Irenæus's Opinion of the Son, whom he understood to be here set forth, as the Lord himself, in opposition to an Angel, Ambassador, or Agent.

He often lays an Emphasis upon his being the Lord himself, as a little above: *That Sign of our Salvation*, saith he, *is the Lord himself, who is Emmanuel of the Virgin; for it was the Lord himself, that saved them.* Compare Chap. IV. N^o 7. and Note there.

— He subjoins these Words, as a Passage of the same Prophet: *The Lord, the Holy one of Israel remembered his Dead, that slept in the Grave (in the Land of burying) and came down to 'em, to preach to 'em the glad Tidings of his Salvation.*^w——

This, it seems, was found in some Copies of the LXX Version, and the matter and turn of Expression was such, as might easily impose upon those Fathers that were not acquainted with the Hebrew Code: Justin Martyr suspected it was wanting in many Copies of the LXX, by a Fraud of the Jews*. I suppose this Passage was originally found in some apocryphal Writing of the Hellenistical Jews, and from thence

^w iii. 20. 4. Et quoniam non solum homo erat, qui moriebatur pro nobis, Esaias ait: *Et Commemoratus est Dominus Sanctus Israël mortuorum suorum, qui dormierant in terra sepultionis: Et descendit ad eos evangelizare salutem quæ est ab eo, ut salvaret eos.*

* Con. Tryph. p. 298. Ἐμνήθη ὁ κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ (lege, ἀπὸ) Ἰσραὴλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτῆς τῶν κεκοιμημένων, εἰς γῆν χάμα-
τος, καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτούς, ἐναγγελίσασθαι αὐτοῖς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ.

transfer'd by some Christian to the Margin of the Greek Bible over-against some Expression of like Import in the Prophet *Isaiab* or *Jeremiah*; for 'tis ascribed to both; and so came to pass for Text in some Copies. It plainly expresseth Christ's Divine Nature, that he is that God, known by the Character of the Lord the Holy one of *Israel*.

16. ^y " The Son—saith: *I openly appeared to them, that sought me not*, Isa. lxxv. 1.

17. ^z " Because the Word of God forms us in the Womb, he saith to *Jeremiah*: *Before I formed thee in the Belly, I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the Womb, I sanctify'd thee, and I ordained thee a Prophet among the Nations*, Jer. i. 5."

He supposes also, that he that appeared to the Prophet *Ezekiel*, chap. i. and to the Apostle *John*, Rev. iv. as the God of *Israel*, sitting on a Throne supported by four Animals, was the Son of God.^a

18. ^b " The Lord hath spoken in *Sion*, and uttered his Voice out of *Jerusalem*, Amos i. 2. Joel iii. 16.

19. ^c " And because he was not only a Man
" that

^y iii. 6. 1. —Filius, qui secundum manifestationem hominibus advenit,—dicit: *Palam apparui his, qui me non quaerunt.*

^z v. 15. 3. Quoniam autem in ventre plasmatur nos Verbum Dei, ait Hieremias: *Priusquam plasmarem te in utero, novi te, & priusquam exires de Vulva sanctificavi te, & Prophetam in gentibus posui te.*

^a Vid. iii. 11. 8.

^b iii. 20. 4. Et rursus significans locum adventus ejus, ait: *Dominus ex (alibi in) Sion loquutus est, & ex Hierusalem dedit vocem suam.* v. etiam, iv. 33. 11.

^c Ibid. Et quoniam non solum homo erat, qui moriebatur

“ that dy’d for us,—the Prophet *Amos* (*Micah*)
 “ saith: *He himself will return, and have Mer-*
 “ *cy on us; he will abolish our Iniquities, and*
 “ *cast into the depth of the Sea our Sins,* Mic.vii.19.
 20. ^d “ And speaking of *John*, he saith thus:
 “ *For he shall be great in the Sight of the Lord.—*
 “ *And many of the Children of Israel shall be turn*
 “ *to the Lord their God; and he shall go before*
 “ *him, in the Spirit and Power of Elias,—to*
 “ *prepare a perfect People for the Lord,* Luke i.
 “ 15, 16, 17. For whom then did he prepare a
 “ People? and in what Lord’s Sight was he
 “ great? even his, who said, *that John was great-*
 “ *er than a Prophet, &c. Mat. xi. 9, 10.”*

As the necessary Construction of St. *Luke’s*
 Words leads us to understand these Words, *the*
Lord their God, as spoken of Christ, before
 whom *John* did go as a Harbinger; so *Irenæus*
 expounds ’em of *him*, who therefore is the God
 of *Israel*; above whom there is no God. For
 he produces this Text as a Proof, that he who
 is here spoken of, as being stiled *Lord and God*
absolutely, is the supreme God, and no other
 than the God of *Israel*, or God of the Old
 Testament, whom the *Jews* had revolted from,
 and by Repentance were to return to. ^e “ *Luke,*
 “ saith he, simply, absolutely, and strongly con-
 “ fess’d him God and Lord in his own Person,
 “ who chose *Jerusalem*, and gave the Law of
 “ the

tur pro nobis,——*Amos* Propheta ait, *Ipse convertetur,*
 & *miseretur nostri: dissolvit* (pro καταλύσει, legit καταλύσει)
injustitias nostras, & projiciet ἀπορρίψει, quod habet MS.
Alexandrinum; non, ut Editio Romana, ἀπορρίψουσιναι, malè,) in
altitudinem maris peccata nostra.

^d iii. 10. 1. ^e *Lucas*——simpliciter, & absolutè, & firmè
 Deum & Dominum confitens ex sua Persona, eum qui elegerat
Jerusalem, & legis dationem Sacerdotii fecerit, cujus est
 &

“ the Priesthood, and whose Angel *Gabriel* is.
 “ For he knew no other above him ; for if he
 “ had any Knowledge of a more perfect God
 “ and Lord, besides him, he would never have
 “ stiled him—God and Lord in so full and ab-
 “ solute a manner,”—and then cites the Text
 of *Luke* inserted above ; where our blessed Sa-
 viour is stiled God and Lord absolutely, and con-
 sequently is, according to *Irenæus*, that God
 who had no God above him ; and herein his
 Scheme differs from *Dr. Clarke's* ^e.

21. He understood the whole Text, *Rom. ix.*
 5. concerning Christ, as having two Natures
 joined in one Person. ^f “ And again, saith he,
 “ *Paul* writing to the *Romans* concerning *Is-*
 “ *rael*, saith : *Whose are the Fathers, and of*
 “ *whom Christ, according to the Flesh came, who is*
 “ *God over all (supreme God, as Dr. Clarke would*
 render it in another Case) *“ blessed for evermore.”*

& Angelus *Gabriel*. Etenim alterum super hunc nesciebat :
 Si enim intellectum perfectioris alicujus Dei & Domini, præ-
 ter hunc, habuisset, non utique hunc,—absolutè, & in totum,
 Dominum & Deum confiteretur.—— Sed & de *Joanne* di-
 cens, sic ait : *Erit enim magnus in conspectu Domini, & mul-*
tos filiorum Israël convertet ad Dominum Deum ipsorum, &
ipse præcedet in conspectu ejus, in Spiritu & virtute Eliæ,
præparare Domino plebem perfectam. Cui ergo populum
 præparavit, & in cujus Domini conspectu ma nus factus est ?
 utique ejus, qui dixit : *Quoniam plusquam Prophetæ habuit*
aliquid Joannes, &c.

^e Scripture-Doctrine, N^o 534. p. 71, 72.

^f iii. 16. 2, 3. ——— Neque alium quidem Jesum, alte-
 rum autem Christum suspicaremur fuisse, sed unum & eun-
 dem sciremus esse.——— *Paulus* ad *Romanos* scribens de
Israel, dicit : *Quorum Patres, & ex quibus Christus secundum*
carnem, qui est Deus super omnes benedictus in sæcula.

C H A P. VII.

Divine Attributes ascribed to the Son.

I. **T**HE Son is equal to the infinite Father in Greatness and Knowledge.

1. ^a “ God doth all things in Measure and Order ; and there is nothing unmeasur’d with him, because there is nothing unnumber’d. And one said well, that the immense Father himself is measur’d in the Son : For the Measure of the Father is the Son, because he comprehends (or contains) him.

2. ^b “ Now the Father, who in respect of us, is invisible and immense, his own Word knows ; and tho’ he is ineffable, he declares him to us ; and on the contrary, the Father only knows his own Word.”

The former Passage is the Testimony of two Witnesses, *Irenæus* and another Catholic Father, either antienter, or contemporary, whose Saying he cites with Approbation : The Expressions are clear and strong, and can signify no less than the Equality of the Father and Son, which is the Foundation of their mutual Comprehension. For as the Reason of our Incapa-

^a iv. 4. 2. Ἀπαντα μέτρα καὶ τάξεις ὁ Θεὸς ποιεῖ, καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὅτι μὴ ἐν ἀναριθμητῷ. — Omnia enim mensura & ordine Deus facit, & nihil non mensum apud eum, quoniam nec incompositum. Et bene, qui dixit ipsum immensum Patrem in Filio mensuratum : mensura enim Patris, Filius, quoniam & capit eum.

^b iv. 6. 3. Et Patrem quidem invisibilem & indeterminabilem, quantum ad nos est, cognoscit suum ipsius Verbum ; & cum sit inenarrabilis, ipse enarrat eum nobis ; rursus autem Verbum suum solus cognoscit Pater.

city to comprehend God, is the Disproportion between him and us; he is infinite, and we finite; as a Nutshell cannot hold and measure the vast Ocean. So the Son's Capacity to measure and comprehend the infinite Father is founded in an Equality of Nature. Compare what *Tatian* says to this Purpose: "That which is less, saith he, cannot attain the comprehensive Knowledge of *that which is greater*," or of God. The *Valentinians* themselves were sensible of this, and so held, that the only-begotten Son, who alone could comprehend the Greatness of the Father, was equal to him^d. And *Irenæus*, by asserting elsewhere God's being incomprehensible to all Creatures, shews what were his Sentiments concerning the Son, who perfectly comprehends him. "God, saith he, is in respect of his Greatness, unknown to all that were made by him^e."

II. He is Co-eternal.

I. ^f "Not only before *Adam*, but before any thing at all was created, the Word glorify'd his Father, abiding in him; and was himself glorify'd by the Father, as he saith:
" *Father*,

^c *Tatian*. Con. Græcos, p. 154. c. Τὸ ᾧ ἑλάττω, κατάληψιν ἐκ ἑαυτοῦ ποιῆσαι τῷ κρείττω.

^d *Iren.* i. 1. 1. — Ταύτην (Σιγὴν) — ἀποκυῖσαι Νῆν, ἑμοίων τε καὶ ἴσον τῷ προβαλόμῃ, καὶ μόνον χαρῆναι τὸ μίγεσθαι τῷ πατρί.

Confer *Philon*. Lib. Quis rerum divinarum hæres sit. p. 400. D. αἰεὶ τὸ περιέχον τῷ περιεχομένῳ μέτρον.

^e iv. 20. 4. Deus — secundum magnitudinem quidem ignotus est omnibus his, qui ab eo facti sunt.

^f iv. 14. 1. Non enim solum ante *Adam*, sed & ante omnem constitutionem, glorificabat Verbum Patrem suum, manens in eo; & ipse à Patre clarificabatur, quemadmodum ipse ait:

“ *Father, glorify me with the Glory which I had
 “ with thee, before the World was made, John
 “ xvii. 5.*”

’Tis observable here, 1. That there was a Relation and personal Distinction between the Father and Son, supposed in their glorifying one another, antecedent to the Son’s going forth to the Work of Creation, which must be founded in a prior and eternal Generation.

2. He draws an Argument from the Father and Son’s Co-existence and mutual Glorification before the Creation, to prove, that God is self-sufficient, and did not make Man, because he needed his Service; which Argument necessarily supposeth, that the Son is not a Creature, but God himself; else his needing him would destroy his Self-sufficiency, as much as his wanting Man’s Service. And if any one will impartially consider the Place, he will find, that *Self-sufficiency*, which is the same as *Independence*, is supposed to be a Divine Attribute common to the Father and Son^g. So that Dr. Clarke greatly differs from our Author, in reckoning (τέλειον, ἀνευθενής) *Perfection and Independence* personal Characters of the Father, whereby he is distinguish’d from the Son^h.

3. His expressing the Son’s eternal Co-existence with the Father by his being *with him before the beginning of the World*, is grounded on ait: *Pater, clarifica me claritate, quam habui apud te, priusquam mundus fieret.*

^g iv. 13. 4. Sed neque *Abrahæ* amicitiam propter indigentiam assumpsit Dei Verbum, existens ab initio perfectus: — Sed ut ipsi *Abrahæ* donaret æternam vitam, existens bonus. — Confer, quæ fufius Cap. sequenti differit. c. 14. 1. Igitur initio non quasi indigens Deus hominis, plasmavit *Adam*. — Et postea, est enim dives, perfectus, & sine indigentia. Gr. τέλειον καὶ ἀνευθενής.

^h Scripture-Doctrine, p. 273. Ed. 2^d.

this

this Scripture-principle, viz. *That before the Mosaic Creation nothing had a being, but the eternal God.* The Distinction of an *ante-mundane* and *absolute Eternity* was unknown to the inspired Writers and the Orthodox Fathers. *Irenæus*, in answer to that curious Question, viz. *What was God doing before the Creation of the World?* owns his Ignorance and the Scriptures Silence in this Pointⁱ: An Argument, that he knew nothing of ante-mundane Productions; else he might have answer'd, that he produced his own Son, a Work, according to the *Arians*, at least as great as the Creation of the World. For to make a *Creator* was certainly more difficult than to create a World, which, it seems, a Creature was capable of. But that there was a Creation before the *Mosaic* one, and a Beginning before the scriptural Beginning, and a temporary Being before the Commencement of Time, are mere Fictions of Men, that would *be wise above what is written*: and upon that account are to be rejected together with an ante-mundane World of *Æons*, the Productions of the fruitful Imaginations of Men.

2. ^k “The Son, who always co-existed with
“ the Father, of old and ever since the Beginning reveals the Father to Angels and Arch-
“ angels, to Principalities and Powers.—

ⁱ ii. 28. 3. — Si quis interroget: Antequam mundum faceret Deus, quid agebat? dicimus, quoniam ista responsio subjacet Deo. Quoniam autem mundus hic factus apotelesos à Deo, temporale initium accipiens, Scripturæ nos docent: quid autem ante hoc Deus sit operatus, nulla Scriptura manifestat, &c.

^k ii. 30. 9. Semper autem coëxistens Filius Patri, olim & ab initio semper revelat Patrem, & Angelis, & Archangelis, & Potestatibus & Virtutibus, &c.

3. ^l “ God

3. ¹ “ God needed not the Angels for the
 “ Production of those things that he had deter-
 “ min’d with himself to make, since he had
 “ his own Hands: For his Word and Wisdom,
 “ his Son and Spirit are ever with him.—

4. ^m “ Now that the Word, that is, the
 “ Son was always with the Father, I have de-
 “ monstrated at large.

5. ⁿ “ I have shewn, that the Son did not
 “ begin to exist when he was born, having al-
 “ ways existed with the Father.”

See more of this in the Chapter concerning
 the Generation of the Son; and compare Chap.
 IV. Passage 2, and the Note upon it, and the
 Dissertation in the end, upon ἀγέννητος.

III. He is unchangeable.

1. ^o “ The Word of God is ever the same.

2. ^p “ Since the Word of God is always
 “ one and the same.”

IV. He is impassible in his pre-existent Na- ture.

¹ iv. 20. 1. Nec enim indigebat horum (Angelorum) Deus
 ad faciendum quæ ipse apud se prædefinierat fieri, quasi ipse
 suas non haberet manus. Adest enim ei semper Verbum &
 Sapientia, Filius & Spiritus, &c.

^m Ibid. N^o 3. Et quoniam Verbum, id est, Filius, semper
 cum Patre erat, per multa demonstravimus.

ⁿ iii. 18. 1. Exclusa est omnis contradictio dicentium: si
 ergo tunc natus est, non erat ergo ante Christus. Ostendi-
 mus enim quia non tunc cœpit Filius Dei, existens semper
 apud Patrem.

^o iv. 35. 2. Semper enim id ipsum (Gr. ὁ αὐτός, idem)
 Verbum Dei.

^p iv. 36. 4. Unum & idem cùm semper sit Verbum Dei,
 &c.

1. 9 “The Prophets spake of him as present,
 “ who was not yet come, and as passible, who
 “ is impassible.

2. 1 “The invisible one became visible, the
 “ incomprehensible was made comprehensible,
 “ he who is impassible, capable of suffering,
 “ and the Word, Man.

V. He is Almighty.

f “The strong Man cannot be overcome by
 “ one that is less, or equal ; but by one that is
 “ mightier, now the Word of God is mighty
 “ above all.

1 “—The Word, who is perfect in all things,
 “ because he is the powerful Word, and true
 “ Man.”—— Again: “The Word of God
 “ powerful in all things.”——

He expresses the Divine Omnipotence in the
 same manner elsewhere : “ God, saith he, is
 “ *powerful in all things* ”, *i. e.* God can do all
 things.——Perhaps he call’d the Word *παντο-*
δύναμις Ⓞ, in Imitation of the Author of the
 Book of Wisdom ^w; or if it was, *ἐν παντί*
δυνατός,

⁹ iv. 20. 8. —Eum qui nondum aderat, adesse dicentes
 (Prophetæ) & impassibilem passibilem annuntiantes.——

^r iii. 16. 6. —Invisibilis visibilis factus, & incomprehen-
 sibilis factus comprehensibilis, & impassibilis passibilis, & Ver-
 bum homo.——

^f v. 22. 1. Neque enim à minori, neque ab æquali fortis
 vinci potest, sed ab eo qui plus potest. Plus autem potest
 super omnia Verbum Dei.

iii. 8. 2. Sed & Diabolum cum dixisset fortem, non in totum, sed velut
 in comparatione nostrâ ; semetipsum in omnia & verè fortem ostendit
 Dominus.——

^t v. 1. 1. ---Verbi, qui est perfectus in omnibus : quo-
 niam Verbum potens, & homo verus.---& postea, Ibid.----
 potens in omnibus Dei Verbum.-----

^v iv. 20. 5. Potens est enim in omnibus Deus.

^w Sap. 18. 15. —Παντοδύναμις Ⓞ ὁ λόγος, κ. τ. ε.

Confer

δυνατός, in the *Greek*, the Sense is the same.—
See the next Chapter.

C H A P. VIII.

The Divine Works of Creation and Providence ascribed to Christ.

I. **T**HE Creation of the World is the Son's glorious Work, and a Proof of his eternal Power and Godhead.

That we may have a just Representation of the Primitive Faith in this great Point, I shall give a brief Account of it, as deliver'd by *Irenæus*, in a few Propositions.

Prop. I. Creation cannot without Absurdity be ascribed to a Creature.

^a “ It does not appear, that the Devil made any thing at all, since even he is a Creature of God himself, as the other Angels also are.”

Prop. II. The Son of God made the World by an inherent Power, not communicable to other Beings.

^b “ The Angels did not make us ; nor indeed could they make the Image of God, nor any other, but the Word of God.”

Confer *Tertull.* adv. Prax. C. 17. — Quasi qui venturus est, non sit omnipotens: cum & Filius omnipotentis tam omnipotens sit, quam Deus Dei Filius.

^a iv. 41. 1. Nihil enim in totum Diabolus invenitur fecisse, videlicet cum & ipse Creatura sit Dei, quemadmodum & reliqui Angeli.

^b iv. 20. 1. Non ergo Angeli fecerunt nos, nec nos plasmaverunt, nec Angeli potuerunt imaginem facere Dei ; nec alius quis præter Verbum Domini.

If the Word created only by the Father's Power, and that Power might be communicated to a finite Creature, 'tis undeniable that an Angel might exercise it, which *Irenæus* denies.

Prop. III. Creation is a Work of Divine and Almighty Power, and a plain Proof of the Godhead of the Creator.

Irenæus represents it as a great Absurdity in the Heretics, that they held this World to be the Work of an inferior Power. ^c "They pretend, saith he, that they can shew something higher and greater than the God that made the Heaven and Earth, and all things in them.

^d "To ascribe the Substance of created things to the Power and Will of the God of all, is credible and consistent enough; and in this Case we may well say; *What is impossible with Men, is possible with God.* For Men cannot make any thing of nothing, but of pre-existent Matter: But God is more excellent than Men, on this account chiefly, that he himself produced Matter to work on, which had no being before.

This Principle, viz. *That the Creation of the World is a Work of Almighty Power, and a demonstrative Proof of the supreme Godhead of its*

^c I. Præf. i. — Ως ὑψηλότερόν τι καὶ μείζον ἔχουσιν ἐπιδείξαι τὰ τ' ἐρανοῦ καὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς πεποιηκότ' Θεῶν.

^d ii. 10. 4. Attribuere enim Substantiam eorum, quæ facta sunt, virtuti & voluntati ejus, qui est omnium Deus, & credibile, & acceptabile, & constans: Et in hoc benè dicetur, quoniam *quæ impossibilia sunt apud homines, possibilia sunt apud Deum.* Quoniam homines quidem de nihilo non possunt aliquid facere, sed de materia subjacenti: Deus autem, quam homines hoc primò melior, eò quod materiam fabricationis suæ, cum ante non esset, ipse adinvenit.

immediate Author, is plainly supposed true every where by our Author^e; and seems indeed to be a self-evident Truth, acknowledg'd even by Heathens: And if you convince an Atheist, that an intelligent Agent was the Maker of the World; by the force of this Maxim he will own, that the immediate Author is God omnipotent and supreme. And the contrary, *viz. That this glorious Fabric of the Heavens and Earth might be the Work of an inferior Agent, or a Creature, was first vented by Simon Magus, and held by the several Sects of the Gnostics, whom Irenæus expressly refutes. The Arians agree with 'em in this general Principle; and so, I think, sap the Foundations of Natural Religion, which is built on this great Principle, viz. That this World shews it self to be the Work of God, that is, of an almighty, all-wise, and infinitely perfect Being, whom we ought to know, worship and glorify as our Creator. This is the Voice of Nature, the Dictate of every Man's Conscience, and the Doctrine of the Scripture, express'd in the clearest Terms, and every where supposed true in its Reasonings. No impartial Person, one would think, could admit the Arian Evasion, viz. "The Work of Creation is "a manifest Proof of an eternal self-existent "Being: but whether it was made by him im- "mediately, or by another in subordination to "him, doth not at all concern the Argument^f."* For what Absurdity then is in the *Valentinian*

^e Iren. ii. 9. 1. — Ethnicis vero ab ipsâ conditione discantibus. Ipsa enim conditio ostendit eum, qui condidit eam; & ipsa factura suggerit eum qui fecit; & mundus manifestat eum, qui se disposuit. — Consule locum.

Absurdum ducit, *aliud esse Deum super mundi Fabricatorem.* Ibid. cap. x. 2.

^f Appeal to a Turk, &c. p. 119.

Scheme?

Scheme? For if the World might be made by one that was not Almighty, how can we tell how many subordinate Powers may be between us and the supreme self-existent God? How can we convince an Infidel, that this World is not the Work of an Apostate Spirit? If once we quit this Principle, I don't see, that we leave our selves any firm Ground to stand on, to deal with Atheists and Infidels. And then the Argument for the Existence of God, taken from the Creation, is only such an one as may be borrow'd from a Wind-mill or Joint-stool made by Man: For we must always at last run it up to a first Cause. *Irenæus* has precluded this Evasion several ways; as we have seen, and shall yet farther make appear in the Sequel.

Prop. IV. God the Father made the World by the Son, not as a created Instrument, or inferior Agent, but as his own eternal Word, uncreated, and of the same Nature with himself.

1. He gives the Son the Title of the *Creator of the World*, which according to him belongs to the principal Agent, and not to a mere Instrument.

1. ^g “The Word of God the Maker of all things——perfectly cur'd his own Workmanship.”

2. ^h “The Word of God the Creator, Former and Maker of all things.”

^g v. 12. 6. Fabricator enim universorum Dei Verbum,— suum plasma omni modo curavit.

^h i. 15. 5. —Quis sustinebit te in Schemata & numeros——concludentem universorum Conditorum, & Demiurgum, & Factorem Verbum Dei? — Gr. τὸν τῶν πλάστων κτίστην, καὶ δημιουργόν, καὶ ποιητὴν λόγον τῶ Θεῷ.

Compare with these and the like Passages, what he says concerning Instruments elsewhere.
 i “ We ascribe not, saith he, the felling and
 “ cutting of Timber to the Ax and Saw, but
 “ to the Man that made (and uses) them. In
 “ like manner, the Father of all, according to
 “ their Scheme, may be fitly stiled the Maker
 “ of this World, and not the Angels, &c.”

2. He frequently asserts, that God made all things *by himself*, to exclude external, inferior Agents.

^k “ —God the Father, who made all things
 “ *by himself*.” See above, Chap. III. N^o 3. and
 4. with the Notes.

3. This Doctrine can hardly be more plainly express'd, than it is, in the two following Passages.

1. ⁱ “ This Discourse (*viz.* concerning the
 “ World's being made by Instruments or infe-
 “ rior Agents) may, perhaps, be apt to per-
 “ suade, or rather seduce them that know not
 “ God, and suppose him to be like weak Men,
 “ who cannot immediately make any thing, but
 “ have need of many Instruments for their As-
 “ sistance

ⁱ ii. 2. 3. —Quapropter non jam securim dicimus concidere ligna, vel ferram secare, sed hominem concidere & secare rectissime quis dicat eum, qui ipsam securim & ferram ad hoc fecit, & multo prius armamenta omnia, per quæ fabricata sunt securis & ferra. Sic igitur justè, secundum illorum rationem, Pater omnium dicetur fabricator hujus mundi, & non Angeli, neque alius quis mundi fabricator, præter illum qui fuit prolator, &c.

^k iv. 36. 1. —Deum Patrem, qui per seipsum omnia fecit.

ⁱ ii. 2. 4. 5. Sit fortasse hic Sermo suavorius, five seductorius apud eos, qui ignorant Deum, & qui hominibus assimulant eum inopibus, & his qui non possunt statim aliquid ex parato fabricare, sed indigentibus multis Organis ad fabri-

“ sistance in their Work : But has no Colour
 “ of Truth to them that know, that the self-
 “ sufficient God of all created all things by his
 “ Word, needing not the Co-operation and
 “ Assistance of Angels in the Creation, nor of
 “ any Power far inferior to himself.—But he
 “ himself, in a manner ineffable and incompre-
 “ hensible to us, fore-ordained in himself, and
 “ made all things according to his own Pleasure.
 “ — Now all things that were made, he
 “ created by his never-failing Word. For it is
 “ the peculiar Glory of God, in which he ex-
 “ cels all others, that he needs not other Instru-
 “ ments for creating things ; and his own Word
 “ is able and sufficient for the Formation of all
 “ things.”

These Words need no Commentary : To sup-
 pose God to have made the World by any In-
 strument, or subordinate Agent, is, according
 to this good Father, to entertain Thoughts un-

fabricationem : non autem verisimilis in totum apud eos, qui sciunt, quoniam nullius indigens omnium Deus, Verbo condidit omnia & fecit ; neque Angelis indigens adjutoribus ad ea, quæ fiunt, neque Virtute aliqua valde inferiori ab illo.— Sed ipse in semetipso, secundum id quod est enarrabile, (lege, inenarrabile,) & inexcogitabile nobis, omnia prædestinans fecit, quemadmodum voluit :—omnia autem quæ facta sunt, * infatigabili Verbo fecit. Proprium est enim hoc Dei supereminentiæ, non indigere aliis Organis ad conditionem eorum, quæ fiunt : Et idoneus est & sufficiens ad formationem omnium proprium ejus Verbum, &c.

* Conf. Sen. Ep. 65. — Plato Ideas appellat, immortales, immutabiles, infatigabiles.—Ep. 58. Hæ (Ideæ) immortales, immutabiles, inviolabiles sunt. De Exemplari rerum æterno multa differit Plato : illud ἀγέννητον, αἰδίων καὶ ἀνώλεθρον esse ait, αἰὲ μὲν εἶναι, γένεσιν δὲ μὴ ἔχειν, αἰὲ κατὰ πάντα καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχειν, &c. Vide ipsum in Timæo, pp. 526, 527, &c. Quæ de Exemplari hoc ἀρχετύπῳ καὶ αὐθυποστάτῳ suo more differuit Plato, ea ad ἑμψυχον Θεὶ λόγον transferebant Philo Judæus & Patres Christiani, ut satis notum. V. Phil. de mundi Opificio, p. 4.— αὐτὸς ἂν εἴη τὸ ἀρχετύπον ἀπαράδειγμα, ἰδέα τῶν ἰδεῶν, ὁ Θεὸς λόγος.

worthy of God, and inconsistent with his Self-sufficiency : And the Power and All-sufficiency of his Almighty Word, is an Argument, that he needed not have recourse to external, created Instruments for doing this great Work. And it hence appears, that the Word created by an essential, inherent Power ; else he should have said, the Father could have made an Angel the Creator of the World by lending him his Power to exercise, contrary to his Scope and Argument. But 'tis plain to a Demonstration, that the Word as Creator is opposed to all Instruments, and his creative Power is used as a Proof of God's Self-sufficiency : The Word therefore is not an inferior Agent, but the same God with the Father ; and to create by him is to create *by himself*, in opposition to created Agents. Compare Chap. III. N^o 2, and 4.

2. ^m “ If our Lord had not mention'd him
 “ that binds the strong Man, (*Mat. xii. 29.*) and
 “ spoils his Goods, and had only call'd him *the*
 “ *mighty One*, he must have been supposed to be
 “ an invincible strong one. But he added a Con-
 “ queror ; for he who binds, conquers ; and he
 “ is overcome, who is bound. And this he did
 “ without any Comparison, lest an apostate Ser-
 “ vant should be compared with his Lord : For
 “ neither he, (Satan,) nor any of those Beings
 “ that

^m iii. 8. 2, 3. — Si igitur non significasset eum qui alligat, & diripit ejus Vasa, hôc autem solum eum fortem dixisset, esset fortis invictus. Sed & adjecit * obtinentem ; tenet enim qui alligat, tenetur autem qui alligatus est. Et hoc sine comparatione fecit, ut non compareretur Domino servus apostata existens : non enim tantum hic, sed nec quidquam ex his quæ constituta sunt, & in subjectione sunt, com-
 * Gr. forte, κρατύνει, seu κρατύνειν : κρατύνει γὰρ ὁ δύνει, κρατύνει δὲ ὁ δυνάμενος, i. e. sed adjecit & victorem ; vincit enim qui ligat (Captivum) & vincitur qui vinculis constringitur,

“ that are created, and in Subjection, shall be
 “ compared with the Word of God, by whom
 “ all things were made, who is our Lord *Jesus*
 “ *Christ*. For whether they be Angels, or Arch-
 “ angels, or Thrones, or Dominions, that they
 “ were created by the God over all, and made
 “ by his Word, *John* has intimated. For when
 “ he said, that the Word was in the Father, he
 “ added: *All things were made by him, and with-*
 “ *out him was nothing made*, *John* i. 3. And *Da-*
 “ *vid* likewise, having enumerated the things
 “ that praise him, namely, all the Beings al-
 “ ready mention’d, and the Heavens, and all
 “ their Hosts, or Powers, he adds: *For he com-*
 “ *manded, and they were created: he spake, and*
 “ *they were made*, *Psal.* cxlviii. 5. comp. xxxiii. 9.
 “ Whom did he command? without doubt the
 “ Word: *by which*, saith he, *the Heavens were*
 “ *made, and all their Host by the Spirit of his*
 “ *Mouth*, v. 6.—Now created things are dif-
 “ ferent from the Creator, and made Beings
 “ from him who made them. For he is uncreat-
 “ ed, without beginning or end, independent,
 “ self-sufficient, and moreover gives their very
 “ Being

parabitur Verbo Dei, per quem facta sunt omnia, qui est Do-
 minus noster *Jesus Christus*. Quoniam enim sive Angeli, sive
 Archangeli, sive Throni, sive Dominationes, ab eo qui super
 omnes est Deus, & constituta sunt, & facta per Verbum ejus,
Joannes quidem sic significavit: Cum enim dixisset de Ver-
 bo Dei, quoniam erat in Patre, adjecit: *omnia per eum facta*
sunt, & sine eo factum est nihil, *Joan.* i. 3. *David* quoque
 cum laudationes enumerasset, nominatim universa quæcunque
 diximus, & Cælos, & omnes Virtutes eorum, adjecit: *Quoni-*
am ipse præcepit, & creata sunt: ipse dixit, & facta sunt,
Psal. cxlviii. 5. & xxxiii. 9. Cui ergo præcepit? Verbo scilicet:
 per quod, inquit, *Cæli firmati sunt, & Spiritu oris*
ejus omnis Virtus eorum, *Ib.* v. 6.—Altera autem sunt, quæ
 constituta sunt, ab eo qui constituit, & quæ facta sunt, ab

“ Being to all things besides. But things that
 “ were made by him, had a beginning: and
 “ whatever Beings had a beginning, are also ca-
 “ pable of Dissolution, and in Subjection, and
 “ depend on him, who made them. So that
 “ ’tis absolutely necessary, they should have a
 “ different Appellation with them, that have
 “ never so little Skill to judge of such Matters:
 “ So that he who made all things, may, toge-
 “ ther with his Word, justly be stiled God and
 “ Lord alone; but made Beings must not share
 “ in the same Title, nor can they righteously
 “ assume that Appellation, which belongs to
 “ the Creator.”

The Reader, by consulting the Place, will find, that after *Irenæus* had asserted, that none is stiled God or Lord absolutely, but the Father and Son, who are so in the fullest Sense, he comes here to consider an Instance opposed to this Assertion, viz. that the Devil is called *ὁ ἰσχυρός*, *the strong one*, Mat. xii. 29. This Passage is his Answer to this Objection; wherein he shews, the Title of the *mighty One* is not taken in the absolute Sense, because our Saviour speaks of one mightier, who overcomes, binds and spoils him. Nor is he stiled strong in respect of our

eo qui fecit. Ipse enim infectus, & sine initio, & sine fine, & nullius indigens, ipse sibi sufficiens, & adhuc reliquis omnibus, ut sint, hoc ipsum præstans; Quæ vero ab eo sunt facta, initium sumpserunt: Quæcunque autem initium sumpserunt, & dissolutionem possunt percipere, & subiecta sunt, & indigent ejus qui se fecit; necesse est omni modo, uti differens Vocabulum habeant apud eos etiam, qui vel modicum sensum in discernendo talia habent: ita ut is quidem, qui omnia fecerit, cum Verbo suo justè dicatur Deus & Dominus solus; quæ autem facta sunt, non jam ejusdem vocabuli participabilia esse, neque justè id Vocabulum sumere debere, quod est Creatoris.

Lord,

Lord, but of weak Men, oppressed by him. And he shews the Absurdity of an apostate Servant's coming under the same common Appellation with the Lord Christ, because he (Satan) is a Creature and in a State of Subjection; but Christ is the Creator and Lord of all. "Neither he, nor any other of those Beings that were created, saith he, and are in Subjection, shall be compared to the Word of God, by whom all things were made." So that the Word is the Creator, expressly distinguish'd from all Creatures, and Beings subject to God. He proves him to be the Creator of all things, even of Angels, Archangels, Thrones and Dominions, *i. e.* the highest Orders of Creatures: And then observes, there must be a vast Distance between the Creator and his Creatures, how excellent soever they be, in order to shew, that one common Name cannot fit both. 'Tis manifest, that the Son is not only comprehended in the Creator, in opposition to made Beings, but principally intended, as his Scope does undoubtedly require.

'Tis plain, the Son is not rank'd with the Creatures; for they all had a beginning, and may have an end; and are in a State of Subjection and Dependence; all which are inconsistent with the Character and Perfections of the Creator: And if the creating Word were a Creature, he could not be stiled God, Lord, or the mighty One in the absolute Sense, as he asserts and proves he is. It would be Robbery for a Creature and Subject to assume the Titles of his Creator and Sovereign. So that *Irenæus* here asserts, that the Son, as Creator of all things, is uncreated and self-existent, eternal, without beginning or end, independent and self-sufficient.

See this Passage fully consider'd and vindicated in the Dissertation on the Word ἀγέννητος.

Several Corollaries might be infer'd from this Primitive Doctrine; as,

1. That Independence is not a personal Character of the Father, but common both to Father and Son.

2. That as Subjection to, and infinite Distance from the Creator is a necessary Consequence of being a Creature; so *Irenæus*. knew nothing of the Father's *Supremacy* over the Son, as a Being in a State of *Subjection* and *Dependence*; for he ranks him with the Father, as Creator, God, and Lord with him, and consequently possess'd of the same infinite Perfections; and contra-distinguishes him from all Beings so *derived*, as to be in a State of Subjection to God. So that he manifestly destroys the *Arian Supremacy* of the Father, and *Subordination* of the Son; he always refers to the *Supremacy* of God the Creator, in which Character the Son and Spirit are included, over the Creatures; all which, and only which are in a State of Subjection to God: And this is one remarkable difference between the Creator and Creatures; he is independent, self-sufficient, and the Author of their Being, and consequently has supreme Dominion over 'em: but they depend entirely upon him, and so are necessarily subject to his Rule. *They are in Subjection*, saith he, *and depend on him who gave 'em a Being*. And elsewhere: " *God has the Pre-eminence in all things, who also is alone unmade, the First of all things, and the Author of Being to all: but all other Be-*

ⁿ iii. 38. 3. Καὶ οὕτως πρωτεύει μὲν ἐν πᾶσιν ὁ Θεός, ὁ καὶ μὴ ἀγέννητος, καὶ πρῶτος πάντων, καὶ τοῦ εἶναι τοῖς πᾶσι παρ' αὐτοῦ: τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα ἐν ὑποταγῇ μένει τοῦ Θεοῦ.

ings continue in Subjection to God. A Creature and a Being in Subjection to God were convertible Terms with him; a creating Creature, and a Creator subject to the supreme Dominion of a Superior, were Monsters not heard of in his Days, except in the Dreams of the several Sects of the Gnostics.

3. That the Son's Concern in the Creation of the World was such, that his Divine Attributes, his Dignity and Excellency above all Creatures may be inferred from it. He knew of no Agency in this glorious Work, but what was a Demonstration of the Godhead, i. e. *the Supremacy, Self-existence, Independence, Self-sufficiency*, and other Perfections of the Creator. For he makes use of Creation as a Medium to prove the infinite Perfections of the Creator, even when speaking of the creating Word, and with a View to apply his Argument to him.

See the like Reasoning in the Appendix concerning the Spirit, second Passage.

II. The no less Divine Work of Providence, or the Preservation and Government of the whole World is ascribed also to the Son.

◦ “ The Word of God is truly the Maker
 “ of the World; and this is our Lord, who
 “ in the last Times became Man, being in this
 “ World, and in an invisible manner contains
 “ and upholds all things that are made, and per-

◦ v. 18. 3. Mundi enim factor verè Verbum Dei est: hic autem est Dominus noster, qui in novissimis temporibus homo factus est, in hoc mundo existens, & secundum invisibilitatem continet quæ facta sunt omnia, & in universâ conditione infixus, quoniam Verbum Dei gubernans & disponens omnia; & propter hoc in sua invisibiliter (lege, visibiliter) venit, & caro factum est.

Q 2

“ vades

“ vades and is present in the whole Creation,
 “ because he is the Word of God governing
 “ and disposing all things ; and therefore he
 “ came visibly into his own World, and was
 “ made Flesh, &c.

P “ The Lord came visibly into his own
 “ World, and his own Creation, which is up-
 “ held by him, bore himself.”——

Observe here, 1. The Government and Preservation of the whole Creation, here ascribed to the Son, was to *Irenæus* no less a peculiar Work of God, than Creation, of which no Creature is capable : “ For the Creation, says he
 “ elsewhere, is not under Satan’s Power ; since
 “ he is one of the Creatures himself¹”. See Chap. I. Princ. VI.

2. The Son, as the eternal Word of God, is not concern’d in this divine Work, as an Agent for another ; but has a natural Propriety in the World by Right of Creation : And he came into it, not as a Steward, or Viceroy to oversee what was *not his own*, but as a Master into *his own* House, and a King into *his own* Kingdom.

3. He supports and governs the whole Creation, which is a Work of Divine and Almighty Power, by way of *invisible Omnipresence* : He pervades and fills all things, is present and operates every where : And this is an incommunicable Attribute of the infinite Being, whose immense Essence fills all things.

P Ibid. 19. 1. Manifestè itaque in sua propria venientem Dominum, & sua propria eum bajulante conditione, quæ bajulatur ab ipso, &c.

¹ v. 24. 2. Neque enim conditio sub ejus (Satanæ) potestate est : quandoquidem & ipse unus de Creaturis est.

4. When the Creation is said to bear (*portare, bajulare*) the Son, and the Father is elsewhere said to *bear the Creation, and his Word too*^r, these Expressions imply nothing injurious to the Honour of the Divine Nature of Christ. The Creation contain'd and bore his human Nature, as the Virgin *Mary*^f bore God, when our Saviour was in her Womb ; and holy Men are said to *bear*, i. e. to have in them the Spirit of God^t. And thus *Irenæus* supposes the Creation to have born both the Father and Son, because the Father is in the Son^u. When therefore he says, the Father bears his Word, as well as the whole Creation, the meaning is not, that the Son is sustained in Being by the Power of the Father, as Creatures are ; but only, that the Son is in the Father.

N. B. It may easily be inferred from *Irenæus's* Belief of Christ's Divinity, that he allow'd of his *Worship and Invocation*.

^w “ The Catholic Church does nothing by
“ Invocations of Angels, or by Inchantments ;—
“ but in a holy, pure and open manner address-
“ ing Prayers to the Lord, who made all things,
“ and calling on the Name of our Lord *Jesus Christ*,
“ works Miracles for the Benefit of Men, and
“ not to deceive and seduce them.”——

^r v. 18. 2. Pater conditionem simul & Verbum suum portans, & Verbum portatum à Patre, præstat Spiritum——

^f Ibid. 19. 1. —Hæc (Virgo Maria)——evangelizata est, ut portaret Deum.——

^t iv. 20. 6. —Videbitur Deus ab hominibus, qui portant Spiritum ejus——

^u v. 18. 1. —Cùm dixerit Dominus : *quoniam ego in Patre, & Pater in me est* ; quomodo Patrem & Filium simul fabricatio Angelorum portare sustinuit ?

^w ii. 32. 5. Nec invocationibus Angelicis facit aliquid, nec incantationibus,——Sed mundè, & purè, & manifestè orationes dirigens ad Dominum, qui omnia fecit, & nomen Domini nostri *Jesu Christi* invocans, Virtutes ad utilitates hominum, sed non ad seductionem perficit.

C H A P.

C H A P. IX.

The Passages pleaded by the Arians.

I. **G**OD the Father is said to be the *only God*,
above whom there is no God.

^a “Consider, all you that invent such things,
“since he alone is stiled God the Father, and
“is truly so, whom you call the Creator; and
“since the Scriptures own him alone to be God,
“and our Lord confesseth him only to be his
“Father, and knows no other:—Consider,
“I say, how greatly you blaspheme him, who
“is truly God.—”

^b “—— O Lord God of *Abraham, Isaac,*
“and *Jacob*,—who art the Father of our Lord
“Jesus Christ,——who art the only and true
“God, above whom there is no other God:—
“Grant to every one that reads this Writing,
“to know thee, that thou art God alone.”——

The Fact not to be controverted here is, that
the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ *alone* is said
to be God, or to be the *only God*: nor is there
in the Places any express Intimation, that the

^a ii. 28. 4. Cogitate enim, ô omnes qui talia adinvenitis,
cùm ipse solus Pater Deus dicatur, qui & verè est, quem vos
Demiurgum dicitis; sed & cùm Scripturæ hunc solum sciant
Deum, sed & cùm Dominus hunc solum confitetur propri-
um Patrem, & alterum nesciat:——considerate magnitu-
dinem blasphemix in eum, qui verè est Deus.

^b iii. 6. 4. —— Domine Deus *Abraham*, & Deus *Isaac*,
& Deus *Jacob*,——qui es Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi,---
qui es solus & verus Deus, super quem alius Deus non est:
-----da omni legenti hanc Scripturam agnoscere te, quia so-
lus Deus es.——

Son is comprehended with the Father; but he is mention'd as contra-distinguish'd from him.

And the Point to be debated is, Whether the exclusive Term, *Alone*, or *Only*, is intended to reach the Son, and deny his being God, at least in some exalted Sense, in which the Father alone is God.

Now to enable the judicious Reader to determine this Point, I shall observe,

I. That 'tis certain, that the exclusive Terms don't always exert their force *universally*, but are often used *respectively* according to the Author's Scope. This is what every body knows, except a few Persons, who love to step out of the common road, and are for new Schemes in Grammar as well as in Divinity: but they come too late to teach old Authors the use of Terms and Phrases. So that, I think, we must endeavour to find out their Sense by parallel Expressions and Modes of Speaking authorised by ancient Usage. *Josephus* says, "Noe alone was saved in the Deluge:" and elsewhere, that ^d Abraham alone came out of Mesopotamia into Canaan: where the Families of these Patriarchs are not excluded. And Christ himself is said to be God with the exclusive Terms, and other Expressions of the same Import; and yet the Father's Deity is not deny'd. *Sozomen*, in his Account of the Conversion of the *Iberians*, says, "They were all astonish'd at a Miracle wrought by the Power of our Lord, and confessed Christ alone to be the true God. And in another Place

^c Antiq. Jud. Lib. 1. Cap. 3. 2. p. 10. Ed. Oxon.-----Καὶ οἱ μὲν---ἀφανίζονται πάντες. Νῶε^Θ ὃ σῴζεται μόν^Θ.-----

^d Lib. ii. Cap. 9. Sect. 3. p. 74. Καὶ Ἀβραμὸν μὲν μένον ἐκ τῆς Μισσοποταμίας εἰς τὴν Χαναανίαν παραγενόμενον ἐυδαιμονῆσαι.
κ. τ. ε.

^e H. E. Lib. ii. 7. p. 55. Ed. Cant.----Καταπληγέντων οὖν πάντων, καὶ μένον εἶναι Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν συνομολογούντων τὸν Χριστόν.-----

he supposes, that the Emperor *Constantine*, by using the Sign of the Cross in the Imperial Standard, intended to teach the *Romans* to forget their antient Religion, ^f and believe him alone to be God, whom the Emperor worship'd. And *Lactantius* applies to our Saviour Passages that speak of the true God, besides whom there is no other God. ^g *Esaïas* witnesseth, saith he, that *Christ* is God in these Words: *Egypt is weary, and the Nation of the Ethiopians and Sabeans; tall Men shall come over to thee, and be thy Servants; and shall follow thee, bound with Chains; and they shall worship thee, and pray to thee; because God is in thee, and there is no other God besides thee. For thou art God, and we knew it not, O God of Israel, the Saviour, Isa. xlv. 14, 15.—The Prophet Jeremý also saith thus: This is our God, and no other shall be so accounted besides him, who found out all the way of Prudence, and gave it to Jacob his Servant, and to Israel his beloved. After this he was seen on Earth, and conversed with Men, Baruch iii. 37, 38.*

It would be easy to add innumerable Instances of the like Nature^h. But these may suffice to shew, that even when the Term *Alone*, or *Only*,

^f L. i. 4. p. 13. — Μένον ἔ τοῦτον ἡγείσθαι Θεόν, ὃν καὶ βασιλεὺς σέβει.

^g Lib. 4. Cap. 13. pp. 193, 194. Ed. Cant. *Esaïas* Deum fuisse testatur his verbis: *Fatigata est Egyptus, & natio Ethiopum & Saba; viri alti ad te transgredientur; & tui erunt servi; & post te ambulabunt vincti compedibus; & adorabunt te, & te precabuntur; quoniam in te Deus est; & non alius Deus præter te. Tu enim Deus es, & nesciebamus, Deus Israel Salvator.* — Item Propheta *Hieremias* sic ait: *Hic Deus noster est, & non deputabitur alius absque illo, qui invenit omnem viam Prudentiæ; & dedit eam Jacob puero suo, & Israel dilecto sibi. Post hæc in terris visus est; & cum hominibus versatus est.*

^h V. Grot. in Joh. viii. 9.

is added to a human Person, as *Noe*, or *Abraham*, it does not exclude those that must be supposed to be taken in with him upon the account of some Alliance or moral Union : much more, that the Belief of the Antients concerning the ineffable Union of the Father and Son in the same Godhead was such, that they apprehended, when the Father *alone*, or Christ *alone* was said to be the true God, besides whom there is no other God ; the other Person (and for the same reason the Holy Ghost too) was necessarily understood to be included. This their Scheme of the blessed Trinity did require ; by which we may judge, how different it was from that of the *Arians*, antient, or modern.

2. *Irenæus* neither did, nor, according to his own Principles, could exclude the Son, when he calls the Father the *only true God*. For,

1. His Scope was not to degrade our blessed Saviour, but to assert the Divinity of the Father and the Creator, in opposition to *Marcion's* two Gods, and the *Bythus*, and many *Æons* of the *Valentinians*, &c. And so he calls him the Father of Christ, to distinguish him from all these pretended Deities set up in opposition to him, and not to exclude his own eternal Son from Communion in the same Godheadⁱ. Tho' the aptest Simile taken from earthly things must be very imperfect, yet perhaps the Expressions under Consideration may admit of the following Illustration.—Let us suppose, that in the Reign of *Theodosius the Great*, there were *many* Pretenders, as there were *some* ; and that Authors writing in Defense of his Right in Opposition to 'em, had maintain'd, that *Theodosius* was the *only true Emperor* ; no

ⁱ See above, Ch. III. of this Collection, N^o 3^d, and Notes.

body would have suspected them to deny the Title of his Son *Arcadius*, on Supposition of his being then cloth'd with the Imperial Purple. And, to carry the Simile a little farther, let us also suppose, that those Traitors had, together with their Pretensions to the Imperial Dignity, assum'd each of 'em the Name of *Theodosius*: And so the Defenders of the Emperor's Right had express'd their Position thus: *Theodosius, the Father of Arcadius, is the only rightful Emperor*; I hardly think, they had been liable to an Impeachment for High-Treason, as denying the Son's Title. 'Tis true, they would contra-distinguish the Father from the Son; but yet by proving the Father's Title *directly*, they would *consequently* establish the Son's.

2. But the Case of God the Father and Son is very different from that of the Individuals of the human Species, how nearly soever ally'd: For they are really, and in the Opinion of *Irenæus*, so ineffably one in Nature and Godhead, that the Son cannot be excluded by the fore-mentioned Expressions. He is always considered, as being in, and with the Father: He can never be conceived to be separate from him, no more than a *Man's Mind*, or *Reason*, or *his Hands* can be excluded, when himself is spoken of. "The Word of God, saith he, or rather *God himself*, who is the Word." Again: "The living God, together with his Word, is the God of the Living." And again: "Christ himself with the Father is the God of the Living^k." And therefore, according to the

^k See all these Passages above, Chap. V. Prop. II.—Dei Verbum, immo magis ipse Deus, cum sit Verbum.—Et ib. N° 2.—Deus vivus, hic est vivorum Deus, & Verbum ejus.—Ipse igitur Christus cum Patre vivorum est Deus.—And compare Chap. III. N° 3 and 4, with the Notes.

Primitive Scheme of the ever-blessed Trinity, to exclude the Son, when the Father is spoken of, as God, would be to exclude the Father *himself*, that is, one that is the self-same God with him. So that when *Irenæus* speaks of the *one only true God*, it is indifferent to him to sub-join either, *This is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*; or, *This is our Lord, the Word of God*¹. For after he had said, that the Harmony of the moral Precepts of both Testaments, shew'd one and the same God, he adds: "*Now This is our Lord the Word of God.*"——

3. And hence I farther observe, 'tis our Author's way to include the Son in the *only true God*, and that not *consequentially* only, but *expressly*: So that when all seem to be excluded, he is not. As when he says of the Father, ^m *That he comprehends all things, but himself alone can be comprehended by none.* The Consequences of this, according to the *Arian* Scheme, would be, that the Son is not incomprehensible, nor is capable to comprehend the Father: both which are false, and never intended, but expressly disclaim'd by *Irenæus*. As where he says, that the *Son incomprehensible* in his pre-existent Nature, *became comprehensible* by his Incarnation: And that *the Son comprehends*, and, as it were, *contains the immense Father*ⁿ. And when the Apostle cries out, *Who hath known the Mind of the Lord?* &c. *Rom. xi. 34.* *Irenæus*

¹ iv. 13. 4. —Quæcunque-----Communia utrisque sunt, unum & eundem ostendunt Deum. Hic autem est Dominus noster, Verbum Dei.----- See above, Chap. IV. N° 9.

^m ii. 30. 9. ----- Omnia capiens, solus autem à nemine capi potest. See Chap. III. N° 3, above.

ⁿ iii. 16. 6. ----- Incomprehensibilis factus Comprehensibilis.----- iv. 4. 2. ----- Mensura enim Patris Filius, quoniam & capit eum.

takes it for granted, that the Son is not excluded; for thus he paraphraseth the Words: ° *Who else has known the Mind of the Lord? Who else has been his Counsellor?*

But that which is full to the Purpose, and precludes all Evasion, is, that he expressly includes the Son in the *only God*: We have had the Passages already. “*He who made all things,* saith he, “*may, together with his Word, justly* “*be stiled the only God and Lord.*” And again: “*It has been plainly demonstrated, that neither* “*the Prophets, nor Apostles ever gave any the Title* “*of God or Lord, but the true and only God.*” But as 'tis Fact, that according to *Irenæus*, the Prophets and Apostles often stile Christ God and Lord, and that *absolutely* too; so 'tis the very Point he had been making out by many Instances. I add only one Place more, where he sets the same Conclusion in this Light: “*1 We* “*have plainly shewn, saith he, that neither the* “*Prophets, nor Apostles, nor the Lord Christ ever* “*confess'd in their own Person, any other to be God* “*or Lord, but him that is primarily God and Lord:* “*The Prophets and Apostles confessed the Father and* “*the*

° v. 1. 1. Neque enim alius poterat enarrare nobis quæ sunt Patris, nisi proprium ipsius Verbum. *Quis enim alius cognovit sensum Domini? aut quis alius ejus Consiliarius factus est?*

° iii. 8. 3. -----Ita ut is quidem, qui omnia fecerit, cum Verbo suo justè dicatur Deus & Dominus solus.

° Ibid. 1. -----Manifestè ostensum est, quoniam nunquam neque Prophetæ, neque Apostoli alium Deum nominaverunt, vel Dominum appellaverunt, præter verum & solum Deum.

° iii. 9. 1. Ostenso hoc igitur planè——neminem alterum Dominum vel Deum, neque Prophetas, neque Apostolos, neque Dominum Christum confessum esse ex suâ Personâ, sed præcipuè Deum & Dominum: Prophetis quidem & Apostolis Patrem & Filium consentibus; alterum autem neminem,

“ *the Son; without owning any other God or Lord*
 “ *besides. And the Lord himself taught his Disci-*
 “ *ples, that the Father only is that God and Lord,*
 “ *who is the alone God and Ruler of all things.*”

Here 'tis as plain as Words can make it, that none are stiled God or Lord absolutely in Scripture, but *the only true God*, he that is so in the only *proper and primary Sense*: And this is not the Father only, but both the Father and Son. — And let it be observed, that if the exclusive Terms in the later part of the last Passage should be understood, as urged by the *Arians*, *Irenæus* must be supposed to have believ'd, that our blessed Lord contradicted the Doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles. For if he taught, that the Father *alone*, in Exclusion of himself, is the true God; and they owned both the Father and Son as such, there is a plain Contradiction in their Doctrine. But the Truth is, the Father's being the only God and Lord, did not exclude the Son; who yet was not, in our Author's Opinion, explicitly to teach this in his own Person, because he was not to glorify himself. And consequently, according to *Irenæus's* Scheme of the Trinity, the Son's Godhead is not deny'd, when the Father is said to be the *only true God*: which is a Demonstration, that it was vastly different from the *Arian* Doctrine; for by its Principles and Maxims *Irenæus* can never be reconciled to himself. And I think, Dr. *Clarke* has shewn, that the same Maxims and Rules of Interpretation, that oblige the *Ante-nicene* Fathers to declare for *Arianism*, will equally exert

minem, neque Deum nominantibus, neque Dominum confidentibus: Et ipso Domino Patrem tantum Deum & Dominum eum, qui solus est Deus & Dominator omnium, tradente Discipulis. —

their

their Influence, when apply'd to the *Post-nicenes* also, from *Athanasius*, *Basil*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, &c. down to the Compilers of the *English Liturgy*, *Bishop Bull*, and other Orthodox Moderns, all zealous Opposers of *Arianism*. And this may help the Reader to judge, whether the Antients have not been injur'd by the Arts of the modern *Arians*.

If the Reader would rather hear an *Antenicene* Father give his Sense of this Point, I shall refer him to *Tertullian*, in his Answer to an Objection of *Praxeas*, who argued against the *Personality* of the Son from the Father's being said to be *God alone, besides whom there is no God*; and his *stretching out the Heavens alone*. The Argument of the old *Noetians*, or *Sabellians*, as afterwards they were called, and of the later *Arians*, is the same; and the same Answer may serve. The Passage is long: I shall only translate Part of it, and refer the learned Reader to *Tertullian* himself. The *Principle* these early Heretics built upon, was, *That one God is one Person*, viz. the Father, and *more Persons in the Godhead would make more Gods than one*. But not having Assurance enough to deny the Son's proper and supreme Godhead, they were obliged, by the force of their heretical Principle, to make him the *same Person* with the Father. Their Argument from the exclusive Terms, *Tertullian* thus answers.

“ There is then but one God the Father,
 “ and there is no other besides him: which
 “ when he affirms, he does not exclude the
 “ Son,

^f Adv. Prax. C. 18, 19. ----- Igitur unus Deus Pater, & alius absque eo non est. Quod ipse inferens non Filium negat, sed alium Deum. Cæterum, alius à Patre Filius non est.

“ Son, but another God. Now the Son is not
 “ another God besides the Father. And then,
 “ if you consider the Sequel of such Assertions,
 “ you will find them mostly levelled against
 “ Idolaters ; that the Unity of the Godhead
 “ might exclude a multitude of false Gods :
 “ but so as *that Unity* should still comprehend
 “ the Son, who is always to be understood to
 “ be included in the Father, even tho’ not ex-
 “ pressly mentioned, as he is ever undivided
 “ and inseparable from the Father : Nay, it
 “ would rather have supposed his being sepa-
 “ rate, if he had named him : as if he had said ;
 “ *There is no other besides me, but my Son.* For
 “ by excepting him from others, he would
 “ have really made him another. Suppose the
 “ Sun should say, *I am the Sun, and there is no*
 “ *other besides me, except my Rays ;* you would
 “ observe a needless Expence of Words, since
 “ the Rays are included in the Sun. There-
 “ fore he denied, that there was any other God
 “ besides him, because of the Idolatry both of
 “ the Heathen and of *Israel* : as also in Oppo-
 “ sition to the Heretics, who made Idols *by*
 “ *their*

est. Denique, inspice sequentia hujusmodi pronuntiatio-
 num, & invenies fere ad Idolorum faciliatores & cultores
 definitionem earum pertinere ; ut multitudinem falsorum
 Deorum unio Divinitatis expellat, habens tamen Filium
 quanto individuum & inseparatum à Patre, tanto in Patre
 reputandum, etsi non nominatum. Atquin si nominasset
 illum, separasset, ita dicens, alius præter me non est, nisi
 Filius meus. Alium enim etiam Filium fecisset, quem de
 aliis excepisset. Puta Solem dicere, Ego Sol, & alius præter
 me non est, nisi Radius meus ; nonne denotasses Vanitatem ;
 quasi non & radius in Sole deputetur. Itaque præter Semet-
 ipsum non esse alium Deum, hoc propter Idololatriam tam
 Nationum quam Israël : Etiam propter Hæreticos, qui si-
 cut

“ *their Doctrine*, as the Nations did *with their*
 “ *Hands*, viz. another God, and another Christ.
 “ When therefore he asserted his Unity, the
 “ Father acted for the Son, lest Christ should
 “ be supposed to come from any other God,
 “ but him who had before said : *I am God*,
 “ *and there is not another besides me* ; who de-
 “ clares himself to be the *only one*, but toge-
 “ ther with the Son, with whom *he stretched*
 “ *out the Heavens alone*. And even *this Ex-*
 “ *pression* they will lay hold on, as an Argu-
 “ ment for one Person only in the Godhead.
 “ *I stretched out*, saith he, *the Heavens alone*,
 “ *Isai. xlv. 24. i. e.* in respect of other Powers
 “ *alone*, guarding against the Conjectures of
 “ Heretics, who suppose the World to have
 “ been created by Angels and different Pow-
 “ ers.”—— And again : “ Thus by presently
 “ mentioning the Son, he has explain’d, in what
 “ Sense he stretched out the *Heavens alone*, viz.
 “ alone with the Son, as he is one with the
 “ Son. And consequently, it was the Son al-
 “ so, who said, *I stretched out the Heavens*
 “ *alone* ; for by the Word the Heavens were
 “ framed, &c.”

cut Nationes manibus, ita & ipsi verbis Idola fabricantur, id
 est, aliū Deum & aliū Christum. Igitur & cum se uni-
 cum pronuntiabat, Filio Pater procurabat ; ne ab alio Deo
 Christus venisse credatur, sed ab illo qui prædixerat, Ego
 Deus, & alius absque me non est ; qui se unicum, sed cū
 Filio ostendit, cum quo Cælum Solus extendit. Quin & hoc
 dictum ejus, in argumentum Singularitatis arripient : Exten-
 di, inquit, Cælum solus. Quantum ad cæteras Virtutes, so-
 lus, præstruens adversus Conjecturas Hæreticorum, qui mun-
 dum ab Angelis & potestatibus diversis volunt structum-----
 Et post pauca,---ita Filium subjungens ipse interpretator est,
 quomodo Cælum solus extenderit, scilicet cum Filio solus,
 sicut cum Filio unum. Proinde & Filii erit Vox, extendi
 Cælum solus ; quia Sermonem Cæli confirmati sunt.——

II. Another Passage, which the *Arians* lay great Stress on, is that famous one, wherein they suppose *Irenæus* ascribes to the Son Ignorance of the Day of Judgment.

“ But you are unreasonably puff’d up, and boldly give out, that you know the ineffable Mysteries of God; whereas even the Lord himself, the Son of God, own’d that the Father alone knew the Day and Hour of the Judgment, plainly saying: *But of that Day and Hour knoweth no Man, neither the Son, but the Father alone*, Mark xiii. 32. Now if the Son was not ashamed to refer the Knowledge of that Day to the Father, but spoke what was true, neither let us be ashamed to leave to God those Enquiries that are too hard for us: for no Man is above his Master.

And a little lower: “ If any one enquire into the Reason why the Father, who in all things communicates to the Son, is declared by our Lord alone to know that Hour and Day; he cannot at present find a more fit, or decent, or indeed any other safe Account of it, than this: That we might learn by him,
“ (since

* ii. 28. 6. Irrationabiliter autem inflati, audaciter innarrabilia Dei mysteria scire vos dicitis: quandoquidem & Dominus, ipse Filius Dei, ipsum Judicii diem & horam concessit scire solum Patrem, manifestè dicens; *de die autem illa & hora nemo scit, neque Filius, nisi Pater solus*. Si igitur scientiam diei illius non erubuit referre ad Patrem, sed dixit quod verum est; neque nos erubescamus, quæ sunt in quæstionibus majora secundùm nos, reservare Deo. Nemo enim super magistrum est. —

“ Ibid. Sect. 8. Etenim si quis exquirat causam, propter quam in omnibus Pater communicans Filio, solus scire horam & diem à Domino manifestatus est; neque aptabilem magis, neque decentiorem, nec sine periculo alteram quam hanc inveniat in præsentī; (quoniam enim solus verax Magister

“ (since our Lord is the only true Teacher) that
 “ the Father is over all : for *the Father*, saith
 “ he, *is greater than I*, Joh. xiv. 28. The Fa-
 “ ther then is declared by our Lord to have the
 “ Preference in Knowledge also, to the End,
 “ that we likewise, as long as we live in this
 “ World, may leave perfect Knowledge, and
 “ such hard Questions to God.”

These Passages must refer either to Christ's divine, or human Nature.

I. Tho' we should suppose that *Irenæus* speaks of the Son, as God, yet 'tis certain he does not impute Ignorance to him. This will appear by considering the Place it self, and comparing others with it.

1. To make out *This* from the Passages themselves, I would observe that his Scope is not to degrade the Son, or to deny his Godhead, which is not consistent with the least degree of Ignorance ; but to expose the assuming Pretensions of the Heretics to a perfect Knowledge of the deep Things of God : To make them blush, if possible, he sets before them the *Humility* of Christ, who did not come into the World to *glorify himself*, but the Father, and so *refer'd* to him the Knowledge of the Day and Hour of Judgment. For he never says, that the Son *was ignorant* of that Day, but that the Father *is set forth* by our Saviour, as alone knowing it, *i. e.* *He refers the Knowledge of it to the Father*, and the Father is declared to have the Preference in

gister est Dominus) ut discamus per ipsum, super omnia esse Patrem. Etenim Pater, ait, *major me est*. Et secundum agnitionem itaque præpositus esse Pater annuntiatus est à Domino nostro ad hoc, ut & nos, in quantum in figurâ hujus mundi sumus, perfectam Scientiam, & tales quæstiones concedamus Deo.

Knowledge, which is *original* in him, and *derived* in the Son, as begotten of him from all Eternity.

This must be plain to every one, that impartially considers his Expressions. Had he believ'd the Son to have been really ignorant of this great Secret, he would have framed his Argument in a different manner, and with greater Advantage, to this Purpose: "Was our Lord
" himself ignorant of that Day? Did the Fa-
" ther with-hold from his own Son the Know-
" ledge of it? What insupportable Arrogance
" is it in you to pretend to be intimately ac-
" quainted with far more abstruse and ineffable
" Mysteries?"

Besides, 'tis observable, with what *Caution* he expresseth himself, how he *qualifies* the seeming Harshness of the Expressions, as sensible of the Difficulty of the Subject, and the Danger of Error and Impiety in ascribing any degree of Ignorance to the Son. The Text cited by him (*Mark* xiii. 32.) appeared to him to contain a Difficulty, that it was not easy to find a Solution of, and in which an Error is very dangerous, for no other reason, but because our Lord seems to decline assuming to himself, in some respect or other, the Knowledge of one Secret, and refers it to the Father. Now had he supposed the *Logos* capable of Ignorance, why should not the Place seem as plain and easy to him, as to our modern *Arians*?

'Tis plain, our Saviour is not consider'd here, as an Instance of *Ignorance* in the least degree, but as an excellent Pattern of *Humility and Self-abasement* in not exalting himself, but referring all to the Father. And hence in this very Place

he speaks of him, as omniscient. ^w “The Father, saith he, in all things communicates to the Son.” Again: ^x “These things we must leave to God and to his Word.” Again: ^y “The Spirit of our Saviour, which is in him, searches all things, even the deep things of God.” This, without doubt, is meant of Christ’s divine Nature; for to That the Fathers often refer this Text of the Apostle, 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11. which is ignorantly, and without ground deny’d by Dr. *Whitby*^z. See the Passages refer’d to in the Margin^a.

2. ’Tis demonstrably certain from other Places, that *Irenæus* did not believe the λόγος, or divine Nature to be capable of Ignorance. For he every where supposes him to be perfect in Knowledge, to comprehend the immense Father, &c. as has been shewn above.

But he had a very direct Occasion to shew his Abhorrence of such a blasphemous Tenet, by so often exposing the Folly, Impiety and Inconsistency of the *Valentinians* in ascribing Ignorance to the Word and Wisdom of God, which they divided into two distinct *Æons*. He proves from the Generation and Nature of the *Logos*, that he is not capable of any Ignorance, which cannot be imputed to him, without consequentially charging the Father with it.

^w ii. 28. 8. — In omnibus Pater communicans Filio. V. supra.

^x Ibid. Sect. — Cedere oportet Deo & Verbo ejus.

^y Ibid. Etsi enim Spiritus Salvatoris, qui in eo est, Scrutatur omnia, & Altitudines Dei, &c.

^z Disquisit. Mod. p. 119.

^a *Tertullian*. adv. *Hermogen*. c. 18. Quis enim scit, quæ sunt Dei, & quæ in ipso, nisi Spiritus qui in ipso? Sophia autem Spiritus.—V. etiam adv. *Prax*. c. 8. necnon, c. 19.

^b “If

^b “ If it be impious to impute Ignorance and
 “ Passion to the Father of all, how can they
 “ say, that a passible *Æon* was generated by
 “ him ? And even tho’ they falsely ascribe the
 “ same Impiety to the very Wisdom of God,
 “ will they still call themselves Religious ?”
 “ Again: ^c “ They (the Heretics) falsely im-
 “ pute *Ignorance* and Blindness to the Word of
 “ God.” And a little lower: ^d “ O you vain
 “ Sophisters! How could the Father’s Mind,
 “ or rather the Father himself, since he is Mind
 “ and perfect in all things, beget his *Logos* an
 “ imperfect and blind *Æon* ?” And again:
 “ How silly and absurd is it, that they say,
 “ that even the Wisdom of God was in Igno-
 “ rance?—For this is altogether inconsistent
 “ with the Nature of Wisdom.”—

Now can any one suppose, that all the while *Irenæus* was conscious of his holding the same Opinion himself, which he represents as impious and absurd in them ? No certainly : According to his Principles the Son’s Ignorance of any of the Father’s Counsels, would be like the Spirit of a Man’s being ignorant of the things

^b ii. 17. 6. Si autem impium est Patri omnium ignorantiam & Passionem affingere, quomodo ab eo emissum dicunt *Æonem* passibilem, & hoc ipsi *Sophiæ Dei* eandem impietatem affingentes, semetipsos religiosos esse dicent ?

^c Ibid.—9. — Ignorantiam & cæcitatem commentientes Verbo Dei.

^d Ibid.—10. Et quemadmodum, ô vanissimi Sophistæ ! Nus Patris, immo etiam ipse Pater, cum sit Nus & perfectus in omnibus, imperfectum & cæcum *Æonem* emisit suum *Logon* ? —

^e ii. 18. 1. Quomodo autem non vanum est, quod etiam *Sophiam* ejus dicunt in *ignorantia*, & in deminoratione, & in passione fuisse ? Hæc enim aliena sunt à *Sophia*, & contraria. —

of a Man, or not knowing it self, and its own Counsels and Purposes. “ For, saith he, ^f It “ is absolutely impossible for the *Logos* not to “ know the Father ; for if he knows, as ex- “ isting in the Father, he is not ignorant of “ him in whom he is, that is, of himself.”

I think therefore 'tis plain, even upon Supposition, that his superior Nature is here meant, that *Irenæus* did not impute *real Ignorance* to the *Logos*. So that I cannot help being amaz'd at the Boldness of our *Arians*, who strive to outdo all their Predecessors in talking with so much Assurance and Indecency on this Topic. Dr. *Clarke* is so candid, as to own that *Irenæus* meant no more, than that this Knowledge was *originally* in the Father, and to be referred up to him as the Fountain. And many of the rigidest Sort of the antient *Arians*, I mean the *Eunomians*, went this way in expounding the controverted Text, *Mark* xiii. 32. For there happened once to be a Contest among them concerning this Point : One *Eutychius* aver'd, *That the Son was not ignorant of that Day, as having derived all things from the Father, so as to want nothing* &c. And upon his meeting with Opposition from others, he went to their Patriarch *Eunomius*, then in Exile, who approved of his Tenet.

^f ii. 17. 8. — In *Logos* autem Patris omnimodo impossibile est. Si enim existens in Patre cognoscit, hunc in quo est, hoc est, semetipsum non ignorat.

^g Sozomen. H. E. L. 7. C. 17. p. 302. Ed. Cant.—Εὐτόχῳ τις—τὰ Εὐνομίᾳ Φρονῶν,—ἤρχειτο μὴδὲ ταύτης τῆς γνώσεως ἀρμολογῆσαι εἶναι τὸ ὅτι, ὡς ἀνεκδιῶς λαδόντα πάντα παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ. V. locum.

II. But upon a close Consideration of this Point, I am fully convinced that *Irenæus* supposed our Saviour refer'd to his *human Nature* and his *State of Abasement*, when he spoke of the Son's not knowing the Day of Judgment. For,

1. From what has been observed, it is undeniable, that *Irenæus* thought it impossible for the divine Nature of Christ to have any Secret withheld from it; he never speaks of the *Logos*, as such, having any Revelation made to him; and held, that the Spirit, by which all such Discoveries are made, was not communicated to his divine Nature, which did not need it, but to him, as Man^h. The Text of *Mark* refers plainly to that Knowledge that is granted by way of Vouchsafement and a divine Favour, that is, *revealed Knowledge*: And therefore the Fathers could not suppose the *Logos*, as such, to have any Concern in *this*, as being *essentially* and *necessarily* acquainted with all the Father's Counsels, as a Man's Spirit knows the things of a Man, not by *voluntary Communication*, but by *intimate Consciousness*.

2. He considers Christ, as condescending to be our Pattern, and instructing us by his *Behaviour* and *Deportment*, as well as his *Doctrine*. We might have been taught the same *thing* by a Voice from Heaven, or several other ways; but this good Father conceiv'd it to be a more excellent and effectual way to learn this Truth, and the Influence it should have upon our Spirits and humble Deportment toward God, by the Son of God's assuming the *Form of a Servant*, and accommodating himself to *that* Nature and

^h See above, Chap. II. Sect. 1.

State by his exemplary Humility ; particularly in his Deportment toward the Father, carrying it toward him, as one far below him, emptying himself, and referring all to the Father's Glory. This is plainly the Meaning of these Words, *ut discamus per ipsum*, i. e. *That we might learn by him*, not only as *inculcating the Instruction* in Words, but as *condescending to appear in such a servile Form*, as we do, and shewing us by his *abasing himself*, and *glorifying the Father* in that Condition, how we ought to give God the Glory of his unrival'd Excellencies. In like manner, our blessed Lord says, *in effect*, in the Gospel to his Followers, who are naturally backward to Suffering: " Your Lord and Master " is obliged to bear a Cross: God spares not his " own Son: And do you expect to be excu- " sed? are you above your Master?"

That *this* Instance of Humility refer'd wholly to our Saviour's abased State in our Nature, appears farther from *Irenæus's* hinting, that it was intended for our Instruction only in the present imperfect State.—*Ut & nos, in quantum in figurâ hujus mundi sumus, &c. To the end, that we also, as long as we live in this World, may leave perfect Knowledge to God.*

3. Besides, it is well known, that the Fathers refer'd such Expressions, as *this*, to the Incarnation and the *voluntary Oeconomy* Christ submitted to for our Salvation. As he came not into the World to exalt himself, but rather to hide his Glory under a Veil of Humanity; so he suited his Behaviour and Expressions to this State of Exinanition. No wonder then, that œconomical Expressions frequently dropt from him: He generally called himself the *Son of Man*, forbad his Disciples to publish his being the Christ, the

the Son of the Living God, and his glorious Appearance on the Mount. *Irenæus* supposes, as we have already observed, that tho' he was *truly God and Lord*, yet he taught his Disciples only, that the Father was soⁱ. Thus in *Psalms* xxii. 6. as understood by the Fathers, he says, *I am a Worm, and no Man*:—which is an Instance of his emptying himself, but not of denying the Truth of his human Nature. *Justin Martyr's* Comment on that Psalm is highly worth the learned Reader's Notice: It gives us a just Idea of the way of Thinking the Antients fell into, concerning this Matter. It contains, in their Opinion, a mournful Complaint of our Lord in great Distress, in which he conceals his divine Power, and expresses his Dependence upon the Father for all the Aids he needed. This they took to be an Instance, not of his *want of Power*, but of his *Piety* toward the Father, whom he came to glorify. ^k “I would
 “ even recite the whole Psalm, saith this Chris-
 “ tian Philosopher, that you may perceive *his*
 “ *Piety toward the Father*, and how *he refers*
 “ *all unto him*, and prays to be saved even from
 “ Death by him.—And again: “^l And intima-
 “ ting, that he should be saved himself by the
 “ same God, but not boasting of doing any
 “ thing by *his own Counsel or Strength*. For in-

ⁱ iii. 9. 1. V. supra.

^k Dialog. con. Tryph. p. 324. D. Καὶ τὴν πάντα τὴν ψαλμὸν
 εἶποιμι αὐτῷ, ὅπως καὶ τὸ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εὐσεβῆς αὐτῷ ἀκῶσθαι,
 καὶ ὡς εἰς ἐκείνον πάντα ἀναφέρει, ὡς αὐτὸς δι' ἐκείνου καὶ σωθῆναι
 ἀπὸ τῆς θανάτου τέττε αὐτῶν. κ. τ. ε.

^l Ibid. p. 328. A. — Καὶ αὐτὸς σωθῆσθαι ὑπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς
 Θεοῦ μηνύων, ἀλλ' ὃ τῇ αὐτοῦ βελῇ ἢ ἰσχύϊ πράττειν τι καυχώμενος.
 καὶ ὃ ἐπὶ γῆς τὸ αὐτὸ ἐπραξε, λέγουσιν αὐτῷ τινὲς, Διδάσκαλε
 ἀγαθὲ, ἀπεκρίνατο, τί με λέγεις ἀγαθὸν· εἰς ἐστὶν ἀγαθὸς, ὁ πατήρ
 μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς ἑρανοῖς.

“ deed he did the same on Earth ; when one
 “ said to him, *Good Master !* he answer’d, *Why*
 “ *callest thou me good ? there is one good, even*
 “ *my Father, who is in Heaven.*”

The Expression now under Consideration is very parallel to *this* : Our Saviour, in his low Estate, refers the Knowledge of the Day of Judgment to the Father, and takes no Notice of his own divine Knowledge : which therefore was no Intimation of his absolute Ignorance, but an Instance of his exemplary Self-abasement and Piety toward the Father. We might as well conclude from the Expressions already produced, that *Christ was not good, that the Creator of Heaven and Earth had no Power to save himself from his Persecutors, that he was not a true Man, &c.* as from the disputed Text, *that he was absolutely ignorant of that Day.*

They who object against *this*, his being called *the Son*, seem not to be well acquainted with Scripture-language : I own, the Denomination is here taken from his Godhead and his Relation to the Father, and an Emphasis is laid on it. But we ought not therefore to conclude, that what is said of him, under that Denomination, belongs to that Nature from whence it is taken. *Irenæus* often asserts, that the *Word of God* became *visible, passible, &c.*^m That he was crucify’d, *ipsum Verbum Dei incarnatum suspensum est super lignum* ; that is, *the incarnate Word of God was himself hang’d on the Tree*ⁿ. But did not mean that his superior Nature was visible, passible, or actually suffer’d. The Virgin is said

^m See above, Chap. VII. 4. as also the last part of this Chapter.

ⁿ v. 18. 1.

portare Deum, to carry, or to be big with God °, *i. e.* him who is both God and Man; and not that, as God, he was conceived or born of her.

The Son of Man is said *to be*, or to have been, *in Heaven, and to come down from Heaven*, Joh. iii. 13. Yet it was a great Error in *Apollinaris* to infer from hence, that Christ's human Flesh pre-existed to his Birth of the Virgin, and came down from Heaven^p; and in the *Socinians* to conclude, that the Man Christ Jesus had been lately caught up to Heaven.

But there is a particular Beauty and Energy in the Expression now under Consideration: The Disciples had, it seems, a great desire to know the time of Christ's second Coming: The Words contain an Argument to check this Curiosity, and to make 'em content to have this Secret concealed from them. "This is revealed to none in Heaven, or Earth, no, not to the Son, as dear as he is to the Father." The Son, even as Man, is the most dignify'd of all Creatures, and the Father's greatest Favourite: So that it is like these Expressions: *God spared not his own Son, but deliver'd him up*, Rom. viii. 32. *The Son of God gave himself for me*, Gal. ii. 20. *They crucify to themselves the Son of God*, &c. Heb. vi. 6. The Meaning is not, that that Nature, which was begotten of the Father, suffer'd: But the mentioning of his highest Nature and Relation to the Father puts an Emphasis on his Dignity, and gives Life and Beauty to the Ex-

° V. 19. 1. — Hæc (Virgo Maria) per Angelicum Sermonem evangelizata est, ut portaret Deum. —

^p V. Nazianzeni Epistolam ad Nectarium apud Sozomen. E. H. 6. 27. p. 255. Ed. Cant. — Ὡς καὶ πρὶν κατελθεῖν αὐτὸν, υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου εἶναι, καὶ κατελθεῖν ἰδίαν ἐπαγομένον σάρκα ἐκείνην, ἣν ἔχων ἐν τῷ ἔρανῳ ἐτύγγαλε.

pression: The Sense is the same, as *Heb. v. 8.* *Καίπερ ὡν υἱός. Tho' he were a Son, yet he suffer'd, viz. in his human Nature.*

And it may be observed, that some things are deny'd of Christ without any Limitation in the Words, which yet must be understood only of his human Nature ; as he is said *not to be in the World* after his Ascension, *John xvii. 11.* And yet the Scripture plainly asserts, and the *Arians* would not seem to deny, his being *ever present with his People* on Earth, in respect of his divine Nature. But I am not to vindicate the Text it self, but *Irenæus*, from the false Glosses of the *Arians*.—In a Word, let the Reader observe, that, according to *Irenæus* and other Fathers, when the Father is mention'd even with the exclusive Term *solus, alone*, the Son is to be understood as included. And when our Saviour spake in his abased State on Earth, particularly when he would be our Pattern of an humble, submissive Behaviour toward God, he had the Oeconomy in his Eye, and adapted his Speech to his Circumstances.

III. There are many Passages in *Irenæus*, in which the Father is represented as *ordering* and *commanding*, and the Son as *ministring* to him, and *executing his Orders*, as in the Creation of the World : From whence the *Arians* infer, that the Son is in Nature inferior to the Father.

“ The Son *ministring to the Father* does
“ all things from the beginning to the end, and
“ without him none can know God.

^a iv. 6, 7. Omnia autem Filius administrans Patri, perficit ab initio usque ad finem, & sine illo nemo potest cognoscere Deum.

“ Our Lord, that form’d the Eye, is the
 “ same that made the whole Man, *ministerially*
 “ *executing the Father’s Will.*”

The Question grounded on these, and the like Expressions is, Whether we may infer from them, that the Son is in Nature inferior to the Father?

That I may open the way to the Decision of this Point, I would observe,

1. That acting a ministerial Part, and executing the Counsels and Orders of others does not always fix a *servile*, or *inferior* Character upon Persons. The doing any any good Office in compliance with the Desires, or only for the Benefit of others, is expressed by Terms of this Import; as *Pliny* calls the Divine Providence, *Triste Ministerium*, a *Ministry*, or *Attendance full of Care*^f. The Master in the Gospel is supposed, *διακονεῖν*, *to serve*, Luke xii. 37. or wait on his own Servants: And our Lord himself *came not to be ministred unto, but to minister*, Mat. xx. 28. and condescended to do the Office of the meanest Servant in washing his Disciples Feet; and yet was still their Lord and Master, *Joh. xiii.* The Words used to express the Son’s ministering to the Father, are *ὑπηγεῖν*, *ὑπεργεῖν*, *ministrare*, *inservire*, *deservire*, &c. I shall endeavour to demonstrate by the frequent Use of them in other Cases, that no solid Argument can be drawn from them, to

^f V. 15. 3. Qui enim visionem formavit Dominus, hic est qui universum hominem formavit, voluntati Patris deserviens. Conf. V. 5. 2. -----Manus Dei-----deserviens voluntati Patris. Gr. ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ χεὶρ—ὑπεργούσα τῷ θελήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρός.

^f N. H. L. 2. C. 7. Irridendum vero agere curam rerum humanarum illud quicquid est summum. Anne tam tristi atque multiplici ministerio non pollui credamus dubitemus? ?

determine

determine the Nature, or the Condition of Agents.

Josephus says, ' Balaam order'd King Balac to build seven Altars, and prepare the same Number of Bullocks and Rams ; and he executed his Orders, &c. where Balaam is said *κελέειν*, to command, and the King to minister, *υπεργεῖν*. And so Hiram, a sovereign Prince, is represented by the same Historian, as *ministring* to King Solomon, or *serving him* by helping him to Timber for building the Temple".

Helena, Mother of Constantine the Great, is celebrated by the ecclesiastical Historians for condescending to wait on the sacred Virgins herself at a great Entertainment she provided for them, when she was at Jerusalem. Compare the Accounts of this in the Margin ^w, and you'll find a great Personage acted the ministerial Part to her inferiors, and so is said *λειτεργεῖν*, *διακομεῖν*, *υπηρετεῖν*, *υπηρετις γίνεσθαι*, &c. i.e. to minister, wait, or serve, and to become a Servant.

And this leads us to an obvious and easy Method to reconcile a seeming Contradiction among the Antients. 'Tis common with them to con-

^t Antiq. Jud. L. iv. C. 5. 4. p. 150. Ed. Hudf. — Βαμύς τε ἐκέλευσεν ἐπὶ δέμασθαι τὴ βασιλεία, καὶ τοσούτους ταύρους καὶ κρέας παρασῆναι· ὑπεργήσασθαι δὲ διὰ ταχέων τῇ βασιλείᾳ, ὁλοκαυτεῖ. κ. τ. ε.

^u L. viii. c. 2. 7. p. 340. Ἐγὼ δὲ — ἀπαῖα ὑπεργήσω τὰ ἐπισαλμένα.

^w Socrat. H. E. L. i. C. 17. ad fin. p. 47. Ed. Cant. Καὶ τὰς παρθένους — ἐπὶ ἐσίᾳσιν προτεροπομένη, οἱ αὐτῆς λειτεργούσα, τὰ ὅσα ταῖς τραπέζαις προσέφερε.

Sozom. H. E. L. 2. C. 2. pp. 45, 46. Λέγεται ἡδ' αὐτὴν — συγκαλέσαι πρὸς ἐσίᾳσιν τὰς ἱεράς παρθένους, καὶ ὑπηρετεῖν γενέσθαι περὶ τὸ δαῖνον, παρατιθεῖσαν τὰ ὅσα, καὶ ὕδωρ ταῖς χερσὶν ἐπιχέουσαν. κ. τ. ε.

Theodorit. H. E. L. i. C. 18. p. 48. — Ἀυτὴ θραπαινίδος ἔργον ἐπλήρως, διακοῦσα καὶ ὅσα παρατιθεῖσα. κ. τ. ε.

sider Christ, as *ministring* to the Father in the Creation of the World, and the Instruction of Mankind: He may therefore, in a qualify'd Sense, from the condescending part he acts, be called *ὑπηρετής*, *ὑπεργ*, &c. And yet *Justin Martyr* denies him to be *ὑπηρετής*, a *Servant* or *Minister*. "God sends his Word, saith he, not, as some may guess, dispatching a *Minister*, or *Angel* to Men^x." And *Tatian* has the like Thought, when he argues against the Worship of the Sun and Moon, because they are only *Servants*. "How can I worship ministring Creatures?" He apprehended, it seems, that Christ was not a *ministring* *Servant*, else he would not have adored him, for fear of Idolatry.

Now, as the Empress *Helen* did act the *ministerial* Part, by *Condescension*; and so is said *ὑπηρετεῖν*, and *ὑπέρτις γίνεσθαι*, to *serve*, and to *become a Servant*: And yet if any one should call her a *Servant*, that is, a *Person in a servile Condition*, he might very justly be censured for injuriously degrading her. So the Son of God is not to be accounted a *mere Servant*, or *inferior Agent*, because he ministers to the Father. And hence the *Eunomians* were censur'd, *because they could without Horror preach, that the Son is the Father's Servant and Minister, and the Spirit the Son's*^z. And *Macedonius* degraded and blasphem'd the Holy Ghost, by calling him (*διάκονον καὶ ὑπηρετήν*) a *Servant* and *ministring Spirit*^a. *Ire-*

^x Epist. ad Diognet. p. 498. ———— 'Ου, καθάπερ ἂν τις ἐκλάσειεν, ἀνθρώποις ὑπηρετήν τινα πέμψας, ἢ ἄγγελον. κ. τ. λ.

^y Orat. con. Græc. p. 144. D. Πῶς τὸς ὑπηρετάς προσκυνήσω.

^z Philostorg. H. E. L. 6. C. 2. Καὶ τὸ υἱὸν ἀναιδέστερον τοῦ πατρὸς δεῖλον καὶ ὑπηρετήν, καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ, φοβερόν ἐδὶν ἡγοῦντο λέγειν.

^a Sozom. L. 4. C. 27. p. 173. Ed. Cant.

næus himself, in his Application of the Parable of the Husbandman, plainly distinguishes the Son from Servants^b. “The same Householder sent at one time *Servants*, at another *his own Son*.—Now the Son coming from him as a Father with princely Authority, said; *But I say unto you*: But the Servants came from him as a Lord in a servile way, and therefore said: *Thus saith the Lord*.”

Thus the Son is often called an *Angel* in Scripture, according to the Fathers, because he condescended to carry Messages, and appear as an Angel: But yet was not of the same Nature and Order with those ministring Spirits. Hence *Justin Martyr* says of two of the three Angels that appeared to *Abraham*, that *they were really Angels*^c; implying, that the first, whom he supposed to be the Son himself, was not so. And *Tertullian* is very full to this Purpose;
^d “The Son of God, saith he, is called the Angel, that is, the Messenger of the great Counsel; an Appellation implying Office, not Nature.—But is not therefore to be understood to be an Angel in the same Sense, as a *Gabriel* or *Michael*: For the Son, as well
as

^b iv. 36. 1. —Et eundem hunc Patrem familias [ostendit Dominus] aliquando quidem mittentem *Servos*, aliquando quidem *Filium* suum.-----Sed Filius quidem quasi à Patre veniens principali auctoritate, dicebat: *Ego autem dico vobis*, Mat. v. Servi autem quasi à Domino serviliter; & propter hoc dicebant: *Hæc dicit Dominus*.----Conf. Tertull. de carne Christi, C. 14.---Ipse enim erat Dominus coram, ex sua auctoritate pronuntians, *Ego autem dico vobis*.

^c Adv. Tryph. p. 279. Ἄγγελοι τῷ ἐν ἡμῶν.

^d De Carne Christi, C. 14. Dicitur est quidem magni Consilii Angelus, id est Nuntius; Officii, non Naturæ vocabulo.-----Non ideo tamen sic Angelus intelligendus, ut aliqui *Gabriel* aut *Michael*. Nam & Filius à Domino vineæ mittitur ad

“ as the Servants, is sent by the Lord of the
 “ Vineyard to the Husbandmen, to demand
 “ the Fruits: But the Son is not therefore to
 “ be reckoned one of the Servants, because he
 “ submitted to do the Office of Servants.”

But to return from this Digression; it appears, that when Persons do any thing for others, as *executing their Counsels*, they are commonly said *ὑπουργεῖν, ὑπηρετεῖν*, &c. and sometimes are termed *ὑπηρεταί, ὑπουργοί*, &c. tho’ they be their Equals, or even Superiors. As *Theodoret* calls *Philip*, prime Minister (*Præfectus prætorio*) to the Emperor *Constantius*, the Minister of the wicked Counsels of the Arians^e, τῶν πονηρῶν βουλευμάτων ὑπηρετής. That is, he executed all their unrighteous Counsels and Projects. And of another great Man under *Valens*, *Peter* of *Alexandria* says, ^f *He was the Instrument of their Cruelty*, ὄργανον ἀμωότητος.

And even doing good Offices for our Friends, is express’d by Words of the like Import; as we commonly speak of *serving a Friend*.

But lest I should tire the Reader with the multitude of References, I shall only add a few more Expressions of this sort in the Margin.

2. Now,

ad cultores, sicut & famuli, de fructibus petitum. Sed non propterea unus ex famulis deputabitur Filius, quia famulorum successit Officio.

^e Theod. H. E. L. ii. C. 5. p. 72. Ed. Cant.

^f Apud Theodorit. H. E. L. iv. C. 22. p. 181.

^g Isocrat. ad Demon. Ποιοῦντες μὲν ἐν, ἀπὸ τῶν ἡμετέρων φίλων ὑπηρετοῦντες.

Sophocl. in Ajace, p. 35 — ^h *ἔσε τὸν φίλον.*

ἔς τε

Τοσαύτ’ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀφελείν βελησσομαι.

Ὡς αἰὲν οὐ μενοῦντα.

Opusc. Mytholog. p. 747. Πρὸς ἡ τὰς ἀγαθίας, τὸ σοὶ πρέπον, οὐ τὸ ἐκείναις συμφέρον, ἐξυπηρετητέον.

2. Now, for ought I see, it is plain, that these Expressions concerning the Son and Spirit leave the Matter just where it was; for they don't necessarily infer *any Superiority*, much less a *Difference in Nature*. But we are to regulate our Conceptions of that Matter according to the Subjects spoken of. If a Superior executes the Counsels of, or does a good Office to one of a lower Station, he does it not by *Constraint*, but by *voluntary Condescension*. The like may be said proportionably of Equals. If an Equality in Nature and Perfections be consistent with a Subordination, as in the ever-blessed Trinity, the several Persons may act their distinct Parts in a *voluntary Oeconomy*, and the Son and Spirit may undertake the *ministerial Part*; and this Oeconomy may have its Foundation in the mutual Relations of the Persons too: And yet we cannot from hence conclude, that they are not of the same Nature and Perfections with the Father. As in the produced Instances we are not presently to reduce to an inferior or servile State great Personages, who are said to *serve*, or *minister* to others, &c. but consider their Character, and suit our Conceptions to that. So when Christ is represented as *ministering* to the

Sozomen. H. E. L. vi. C. 32. p. 267. de Silvano. Ὁν δὲ τὴν ἄγαν ἀρετὴν, ὑπὸ ἀγγέλων ὑπηρετούμενον θεαθῆναι λόγῳ.

Jussit Constantinus Imp. Provinciarum Rectores πειθαρχεῖν, καὶ σπαδαίως ὑπηρετεῖν τοῖς ἱερεῦσι. Id. L. i. C. 8. p. 19.

Et Lauricius Dux Militum in Concilio Seleuciensi adesse jussus est, ὑπεργήσων, εἰ δέησιν, ταῖς ἐπισκόποις. Socrat. L. ii. C. 39.

Theodor. Lect. L. i. C. 5. de Marciano Imp.—Ταῖς χεραῖς ἀπάσαις προθύμως ὑπρέτησε.

Dialog. de Oratoribus ad calcem opp. C. Taciti. Cujus [Matris] præcipua laus erat, tueri domum. & *inservire* liberis, p. 603.

Father,

Father, or *executing his Pleasure*, we should not forget his Character and Relation to the Father, *viz.* that he is his *own Son*, *his Word* and *Wisdom*, of the same Nature and Perfections with him; and understand his acting the ministerial Part in a Sense suitable to his Dignity. Nor should I at all wonder, to find something in the incomprehensible God, that has no parallel among Creatures, and can scarcely be illustrated by a Comparison with them. Surely 'tis too assuming to think, that our Ideas represent, or Words express the *deep Things of God*, but in a very imperfect Manner.

And what if the Fathers meant no more by the Son's ministring, than to express the Force of the Preposition ($\delta\iota$) *by*, or *thro'*, *viz.* that the Father did these things *by the Son* in a way becoming himself, without presuming to determine the *Modus*? as God is sometimes said to be *his own Place*, $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma\ \epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}\pi\omicron\varsigma$, not to turn him into *mere Space*, but to express his not being circumscribed by Place, but being $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$.

Were I to enlarge, I could easily demonstrate, that there is no Stress to be laid on that Criticism concerning the Import of the Prepositions $\upsilon\pi\acute{o}$ and $\delta\iota$, the one signifying the principal Efficient, the other only the instrumental Cause, or ministerial Agent. It had its rise, I suppose, in the Schools of the Philosophers, who express'd the Agency of several sorts of Causes by different Prepositions, $\upsilon\phi'\ \omicron\upsilon$, $\delta\iota\ \omicron\upsilon$, $\epsilon\kappa\ \omicron\upsilon$. *Philo* first borrow'd it from them, and finds Fault with Scripture-expressions, wherein this

Virg. *Æneid.* 7. v. 616, &c.

Hoc & tum *Æneadis* indicere bella Latinus

More jubebatur, tristisque recludere portas.

Abstulit tactu Pater, averfusque refugit

Fæda Ministeria.

Accuracy is not observed^h. He was follow'd by *Origen*, and *Eusebius* of *Cæsarea*, &c. To shew the Weakness of it I shall only observe, that when the same Effect is ascribed to two concurring Agents, the Preposition (διὰ) is indifferently used to denote either the Principal or the Instrumental, according as the one or the other was the Subject of Discourse, or happen'd to be first spoken of. As in giving forth Prophecies the Holy Ghost is certainly the principal Agent, and the Prophets only (ὄργανα) Instruments. And yet, as it is usual to say, *The Holy Ghost spake by them*; Acts xxviii. 25. *Well spake the Holy Ghost*, διὰ Ἡσαΐα τοῦ προφήτου, by the Prophet *Esaïas*: So are they said to speak—*By the Holy Ghost*. As in *Justin Martyr*, προφήτου εἰπόντος διὰ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματοςⁱ. And in *Irenæus*.—Λαλοῦντων διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος^k. Let the learned Reader cast his Eye on some more Instances of the like Import at the bottom of the Page^l, and he'll see there must be a great Defect somewhere, when Men think such Strefs may be laid on a weak Criticism, as to raise an Argument from it to determine the Nature of Things, and assign to them their proper Places in the Scale of Causes and Beings.

^h De Cherub. ad Finem. p. 129. ⁱ Just. M. Apol. 2. p. 7. D. ^k Iren. v. 6. 1. ^l Esai. xxx. 1. — Ἐποίησατε βελὴν, οὐ δὲ ἐμοῦ, καὶ συνθήκας, οὐ διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος μου.

Hof. viii. 4. — Ἐαυτοῖς, ἐβασίλευσαν, καὶ οὐ δὲ ἐμου.

Gen. iv. 1. Ἐκτησάμην ἄνθρωπον διὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Heb. vii. 21. Ὁ ᾧ [ἱερεὺς γέγονε]—διὰ τοῦ λέγοντος^κ. κ. τ. ε.

Eph. viii. 10. Ἐγράφη ᾧ διὰ τοῦ βασιλέως—

Theophil. ad Autol. p. 38. Ed. Oxon. Οἱ [προφῆται] καὶ προεῖπον διὰ πνεύματος^κ Θεοῦ.

Plato sic Jovem loquentem inducit, in *Timæo*, p. 530, 531. Ed. Lugd. Δι' ἐμοῦ ᾧ ταῦτα γινόμενα καὶ βίς μεταρχοντα, θεοῖς ἰσάζονται^δ ἄν.

If they suppose, that the Word *Ordering* or *Commanding* will bear an Argument, we have already seen in the Case of *Balaam* and *Balak*, that it does not always imply Authority, or the Exercise of Dominion; but the Sense of it is accommodated to the Character and Relations of the Persons spoken of. If History inform us, that the *Augurs* order'd the *Romans* to offer such and such Sacrifices, &c. or that a Physician order'd his Prince to take Medicines for recovering his Health; we should not from hence infer, that the sovereign Power was lodged in the College of *Augurs*, or that the Prince was a Subject to his Physician. The Margin contains two Instances of this Nature, which might easily be multiply'd^m.

3. Thus, I think, it is plain, that straining innocent Words, beyond the Author's Scope and Intention, is not the way to come at the Truth in any Case. But, in this Instance, it is great Injustice to draw from our Author's Expressions, Consequences that he does not allow, and father them upon him, as his *real Sentiments*, tho' it appears, from the whole Tenor of his Doctrine, that he did not hold 'em, but has rather expressly disclaim'd them. For he abundantly explains his Meaning elsewhere, and teaches, as has been shewn, that God's creating

Philo de Mundi Opific. p. 16. Τῷ δὲ πάντων πατρὶ Θεῷ, τὰ μὲν σπυδαία δὲ αὐτοῦ μένει ποιεῖν οἰκείωτατον ἦν.

Epist. Conc. Arimin. apud Socrat. H. E. L. 2. Cap. 37.----

Οἱ Ἀπόστολοι δὲ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ ἐκήρυξαν.

Sozom. E. H. Præf. p. 3. Πᾶσαν ἐπήσκησας ἀρετὴν διὰ Θεοῦ.

^m Basilus Ancyranus Provinciarum Rectoribus præcepit (τοῖς ἀρχουσιν ἐπιτατεῖν) ut Clericos quosdam invidiâ causâ condemnarent. Sozom. H. E. L. iv. C. 24. p. 168.

Antiochus Joviani manum repulit, καὶ τῶν χειροτονούντων ἀποκριθῆναι προσέταξε. Theodorit. H. E. L. iv. C. 15. p. 166.

all

all Things by his Word and Spirit was not employing *Servants, Creatures, Instruments, &c.* but doing this Work *by himself, by his own Wisdom and Power, or with his own Hands.* According to him to make use of an *inferior Agent*, is inconsistent with the divine All-sufficiency. He manifestly opposes the Son and Spirit to created Attendants and Instruments, and to all that are in a State of Subjection. "The Father, saith he, needed not Angels to create the World by:—Nor did he need any to minister to him in the creating of his Creatures, or ordering the Affairs of Men. But he has a sufficient and ineffable Ministry: For his own Offspring and his Image minister to him in all things, that is, the Son and Holy Spirit, his Word and his Wisdom, whom all the Angels serve and are subject to".

4. Besides, the Son was not a *mere Instrument* in the Creation according to *Irenæus*, for that would not make him *Lord and Proprietor* of the World, any more than a General's Conquest of a Country for his Sovereign would make him rightful King of it, or a Servant's building a House by his Master's Order, would give him a Title to the House. But it has been shewn above, that *Irenæus* held Christ to be by the right of Creation, sovereign Lord of the World, which he could not be by acting a purely mini-

ⁿ iv. 7. ad Fin. Non indigente Patre Angelis, uti faceret Conditionem, & formaret hominem.—Neque rursus indigente *ministerio* ad fabricationem eorum, quæ facta sunt, ad dispositionem eorum negotiorum, quæ secundum hominem erant; sed habente *copiosum & inenarrabile ministerium*, ministrat enim ei ad omnia sua Progenies & Figuratio sua, i. e. Filius & Spiritus Sanctus, Verbum & Sapiëntia, quibus serviunt, & subiecti sunt omnes Angeli.

ſterial Part. °“ Plainly ſhewing, faith he, that
 “ there is one God the Father over all, and one
 “ Word of God, which is thro’ all, by which
 “ all things were made ; and that this World is
 “ *his own*, and was made by him according to
 “ the Father’s Will.”

And this leads me to another Obſervation, that tends to illuſtrate this Subject, *viz.* that when our Author ſo often inculcates, that the Son in creating the World, *miniſter’d to the Father*, and *executed his Will*, he had no Deſign to leſſen or depreſs the Son, but only to oppoſe the Here-tics, who held, that the World was created without the Conſent of the Father of all. He would maintain the Father’s Concern in the Work of Creation and Providence ; and *that* he expreſſes by his *willing* and *ordering* it, which belongs to him as the firſt Perſon in the Trinity. And *deſervire voluntati Patris*, Gr. *ὑποταγῆν τῷ θελήματι τοῦ πατρὸς*, ſignifies no more than to *execute the Father’s Will*, in Oppoſition to doing it *of himſelf*, without the Father’s having any Concern in it. For he lays no Emphaſis upon *commanding* and *miniſtering*, as inferring *Supremacy* and *Inferiority* ; nor ſeems to have had any Speculations about theſe ; ſimply meaning, that the World was made by the Father’s Will, and ’tis his Work, as he had that Concern in it, that properly belong’d to him, as the Father ; and ſuppoſing, that there is a natural Order in the Trinity, and an Oeconomy of the Perſons in all divine Works.

° v. 18. 2. ——— Manifèſtè oſtendens ——— quoniam unus Deus Pater ſuper omnes, & unum Verbum Dei, quod per omnes, per quem omnia facta ſunt. Et quoniam hic mundus proprius ipſius, & per ipſum factus eſt voluntate Patris. ———

IV. The last Expression that seems to favour the *Arians* is, the Son's being represented as *visible* and *comprehensible*; whereas the Father can be comprehended by none, but is the *invisible* God, *whom no Man hath seen, or can see.*

P “ God, saith *Irenæus*, in the last Days gives “ (these Blessings) to Mankind by his Son, the “ *incomprehensible* by one that is *comprehensible*, “ the *invisible* by him that is *visible*.”

There is nothing in our Author, or perhaps in any *Ante-nicene* Writer, more exprefs in Favour of the *Arian* Scheme, than this may seem to be to those that follow the mere Sound of Words. Here there seems to be no need of *doubtful Reasoning*, or *foreign Principles* to force a Consequence from the Words never intended by the Author: In comparing the Father and Son, a difference of Nature and Perfections seems to be plainly exprefs'd: The Father is the *invisible* and *incomprehensible* God; but the Son is both *visible* and *comprehensible*.

And if we should attempt to assail this Difficulty, by replying, that the Author meant no more, but that the Son, who in his divine Nature is equally *invisible* and *incomprehensible* with the Father, did by Condescension accommodate himself to our Capacity, so as to *become visible* and *comprehensible* to us, as in assuming a visible Species, and at last true human Nature, in order to converse with Men; this, I doubt, would encrease their Triumphs, and occasion, perhaps, some severe Invectives against their Adversaries, for straining plain Expressions, that need no Commentary.

P iii. 11. 5. Deus---& benedictionem escæ & gratiam potûs, in novissimis temporibus per Filium suum donat humano generi, *incomprehensibilis* per *comprehensibilem*, & *invisible* per *visibilem*.

But

But it has happen'd well, that *Ireneus* had frequent Occasion to touch upon this Subject : I don't desire the Reader to regard what I say, but only to hear our Author guarding his Expressions, and fully explaining himself on this Head.

q “ Our Lord Jesus Christ, — sum'd up
 “ Man also in himself, the *invisible* being made
 “ *visible*, the *incomprehensible* becoming *compre-*
 “ *hensible*, the *impassible* *passible*, and the *Word*
 “ *Man*.

r “ The Father revealed himself to all, ma-
 “ king his Word visible to all. — And by the
 “ Word himself made visible and palpable, the
 “ Father is shewn.

f “ The Word of God, tho' *naturally invisible*, became palpable and visible among Men.

t “ And for this Reason the Son of God, tho'
 “ he was perfect, became an Infant, and ac-
 “ commodated himself to the Infancy and weak
 “ Capacity of Man ; not upon his own Ac-
 “ count, but because of Man's Incapacity be-
 “ coming thus *comprehensible*, as Man was able
 “ to take in the Knowledge of him. For there

q iii. 16. 6. ---Christus Jesus Dominus noster,---& hominem---in semetipsum recapitulans est, invisibilis visibilis factus, & incomprehensibilis factus comprehensibilis, & impassibilis passibilis, & Verbum Homo.-----

r iv. 6. 5, 6. Omnibus igitur revelavit se Pater, omnibus Verbum suum visibile faciens.-----Et per ipsum Verbum visibilem & palpabilem factum, Pater ostendebatur.----

f iv. 24. 2. Et hujus [Dei] Verbum naturaliter quidem invisibilem, palpabilem & visibilem in hominibus factum, &c.

t iv. 38. 2. Και δια τούτο συνενηπίασεν υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, τέλει ὢν, τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν, ἀλλὰ δια τὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἡπίσιον ἔτῳ χωρέμενον, ὡς ἄνθρωπος αὐτὸν χωρεῖν ἠδύνατο· οὐ περὶ τὸν Θεὸν μὲν τὸ ἰσχύον καὶ ἐνδεὲς, ἀλλὰ περὶ τὸν νεωστὶ γεγενῆτα ἄνθρωπον, ὅτι μὴ ἀγέννητος ἦν.

“ is no Weakness or Indigence on God’s part,
 “ but on Man’s, who but lately came into be-
 “ ing, and that because he is not unmade.

Again : “ “ Wherefore our Lord, in the la-
 “ ter Days——came unto us, not as he might
 “ have done, but as we were able to behold
 “ him. For he might have come to us in his
 “ own ineffable (*Gr.* incorruptible) Glory, but
 “ we were not able to bear the Greatness of his
 “ Glory.—

“ “ In Times past, it was indeed *said*, that
 “ Man was made after the Image of God, but
 “ no sensible Demonstration of it was given ;
 “ for the *Word* was yet *invisible*.——But when
 “ the Word of God was made Flesh,——he
 “ made Man like to the invisible Father by the
 “ visible Word.”

And that we might understand, that the Fa-
 ther, or Son’s being *visible* or *invisible*, *compre-*
hensible or *incomprehensible*, in his Sense, was not
 the necessary *Result* of their *Nature*, but purely
 a Matter of *voluntary Oeconomy*, he shews how
 far the Father himself condescends to be seen
 and comprehended both here and hereafter, and
 why he so far keeps himself invisible.

The Heretics, it seems, argued from the In-
 visibility of God the Father asserted in the New

“ Ibid. Sect. 1. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ἐπ’ ἐχάτων τῶν
 καϊρῶν,——ἦλθε πρὸς ἡμᾶς, οὐχ ὡς αὐτὸς ἡδύνατο, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἡμεῖς
 αὐτὸν ἰδεῖν ἡδυνάμεθα· Αὐτὸς μὲν ᾧ ἐν τῇ ἀφθάρτῳ (Int. Lat.
 inenarrabili, quasi legisset, ἀρρήτῳ vel ἀφράστῳ) αὐτοῦ δόξης πρὸς
 ἡμᾶς ἐλθεῖν ἡδύνατο· ἀλλ’ ἡμεῖς οὐδὲ πώποτε τὸ μέγεθος τῆς δόξης
 αὐτοῦ βεσάζειν ἡδυνάμεθα.

“ v. 16. 2. Ἐν τοῖς πρόσθεν χρόνοις ἐλέγτο μὲν κατ’ εἰκόνα
 Θεοῦ γεγονέναι τὸ ἄνθρωπον, οὐκ ἐδείκνυτο ὅτι ἐστὶ ᾧ ἀόρατος ἦν ὁ
 λόγος.——ὁπότε ὁ σὰρξ ἐγένετο ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ——συνεξα-
 μιείσας τὸ ἄνθρωπον τῷ ἀόρατῳ πατρὶ——per visibile Verbum.
 Lat. Interp.

Testa-

Testament, against his being the same with the God of the *Jews*, who variously appeared to the Fathers, and spake to Moses *Face to Face*.—In answer to this he says.—

* “ — God shall be seen of Men, as our Lord saith: *Blessed are the pure in Heart, for they shall see God*, Mat. v. 8. And yet in respect of his *Greatness* and *wonderful Glory*, no Man shall see God, and live, Exod. xxxiii. 20. For the Father is incomprehensible. But in regard of his Love, Kindness and Almighty Power, he grants even *this* to them that love him, that is, the Vision of God.

Again: † “ The Word of God was made the Steward and Dispenser of the Father’s Grace for the Benefit of Men,—shewing God to Men, and presenting Man to God: Both keeping the Father invisible, lest Man should condemn God, and that there might be room for progressive Knowledge; and again by many Dispensations discovering God, and making him visible to Men, lest Man should wholly revolt from God, and lose his Being.

* iv. 20. 5. — Videbitur Deus ab hominibus; quemadmodum & Dominus ait: *Beati mundo Corde, quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt*, Mat. v. 8. Sed secundum magnitudinem quidem ejus, & mirabilem Gloriam, *nemo videbit Deum, & vivet*, Exod. xxxiii. 20. incapabilis enim Pater: Secundum autem dilectionem & humanitatem, & quod omnia possit, etiam hoc concedit iis qui se diligunt, id est, videre Deum.

† Ibid. Sect. 7. — Verbum Dispensator paternæ gratiæ factus est ad utilitatem hominum,—hominibus quidem ostendens Deum, Deo autem exhibens hominem: Et invisibilitatem quidem Patris custodiens, ne quando homo fieret contemptor Dei, & ut semper haberet ad quod proficeret; visibilem autem rursus hominibus per multas dispositiones ostendens Deum, ne in totum deficiens à Deo homo, cessaret esse.

Again: ^z “ They receive Life, who see God.
 “ And therefore the *inconceivable, incomprehen-*
 “ *sible and invisible* God condescends to be *seen,*
 “ *understood and comprehended* by the faithful.

And in the same Chapter, where he professedly handles this Argument, he expressly says, it was the Word, whose Glory *Moses* desired to see, and who said, *No Man shall see my Face, and live.*

^a “ The Word, saith he, spake to *Moses* Face
 “ to Face;—and *Moses* desired plainly to see
 “ him that talked with him, and it was said to
 “ him: *Stand in the high Place of the Rock, &c.*
 “ Intimating, both that Man is incapable to
 “ see God, and yet that, by the Wisdom of
 “ God in the last Days, Man should see him on
 “ the top of the Rock; that is, in his Incar-
 “ nation.”

Now it would be an Affront to the Reader's Understanding, to suppose, that he needs be told, that according to *Irenæus*, the Son was not *naturally visible* or *comprehensible*, but only became so in his Sense by his Incarnation, and often appearing and conversing with Men in an assumed Species, which was generally *Symboli-*

^z Ibid. Sect. 5. Percipiunt ergo vitam, qui vident Deum. Et propter hoc incapabilis, & incomprehensibilis, [& invisibilis,] visibilem se, & comprehensibilem, & capacem hominibus præstat. Græc. Ζωὴς οὖν μετέχουσιν οἱ ὁράντες Θεὸν· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὁ ἀχάρητος, καὶ ἀκατάληπτος, καὶ ἀόρατος, ὁράμενον ἑαυτὸν, καὶ καταλαμβάνόμενον, καὶ χαράμενον τοῖς πιστοῖς παρέχεν.

^a iv. 20. 9. Et Verbum quidem loquebatur Moyfi apprens in conspectu.—Moyſes vero cupivit manifestè videre eum qui secum loqueretur, & dictum est ei: *Sta in loco alto petrae.*—Utraque significans, quoniam & impossibilis est homo videre Deum, & quoniam per Sapientiam Dei in novissimis temporibus videbit eum homo in altitudine petrae, hoc est, in eo qui est secundum hominem ejus adventu.

cal and *Prophetical*; and that by the like Con-
 descension the Father himself has been, or at
 least will be *seen* and *comprehended* by the faith-
 ful for their compleat Blessedness.

And let him frame as good an Excuse as he
 can, for those who can allow themselves to pro-
 duce such a Passage, and set it before their Rea-
 ders, as *meant absolutely*; whereas, if they have
 read *Irenæus*, they could not but know his own
 Explication of it, which leaves no room for
 the Consequence they would draw from it.

A N

A P P E N D I X

Concerning the HOLY GHOST.

SO much has been already said concerning the Holy Spirit in the third Chapter of this Collection, that might satisfy any impartial Person, that *Ireneus* believ'd his Divinity; and consequently, that it was an Article of the Catholic Faith. He is every where distinguish'd from the Father and Son, as a third divine Person, in whom the Church believed; and yet is joined with 'em, as having Communion in the same Nature. He was ever in, and with the Father, as his Wisdom: He is distinguish'd from all Creatures, as the Object of Faith, and Creator of all Things: And when God made all Things by this glorious Spirit, he did not work by an Instrument, inferior Agent, or Power separate from himself; *that* would have been inconsistent with his Self-sufficiency, and discover'd Imperfection and Indigence, like that of the Creatures: But he did it *by himself*, by *his Wisdom*, with *his own Hands*, which he never was, nor could be without^a.

And several other Expressions and Arguments of the same Tendency have already occur'd, that if all were laid together and review'd, it would hardly be possible to mistake his Sense. For tho' Men may quibble and explain away parti-

^a See above, Chap. III. N^o 1, 2, 3, 4, and Notes on them.
cular

cular Expressions, be they never so clear and strong, yet upon comparing his Principles and Reasonings with them, they will find themselves so hem'd in on every side, that there is left no room for Evasion. However I cannot satisfy myself to conclude this Collection without adding a few Passages more concerning the eternal Spirit.

1. ^b “Now that the Word, that is, the Son was ever with the Father, we have shewn at large. And that Wisdom also, which is the Spirit, was with him before any thing was created, he says by *Solomon*; *God by Wisdom founded the Earth, he prepared the Heavens by Prudence.*—And again: *The Lord created me the beginning of his Ways to his Works; he founded me before the Ages, or from everlasting, in the beginning before he made the Earth.*—He begat me before all the Hills. And again: *When he prepared the Heavens, I was with him, &c.*”

This Passage expresses the Coeternity of the Spirit, for he plainly ascribes the same Eternity to the Spirit, as to the Son: Having largely prov'd the one, he proceeds to the Proof of the other; and when he a little before says, ^c *His Son and Spirit are ever with him*, if absolute

^b iv. 20. 3. Et quoniam Verbum, id est, Filius, semper cum Patre erat, per multa demonstravimus. Quoniam autem & Sapientia, quæ est Spiritus, erat apud eum ante omnem Constitutionem, per Salomonem ait: *Deus Sapientia fundavit terram, paravit autem Cælum Prudentia.*—Et rursum: *Dominus creavit me Principium viarum suarum in opera sua, ante sæcula fundavit me, in initio antequam terram faceret*—*Ante omnes autem colles genuit me.* Et iterum: *Cum pararet Cælum, eram cum illo, &c.*

^c iv. 20. 1. Adest enim ei semper Verbum & Sapientia, Filius & Spiritus.

Eternity is contained in that Expression, it is equally ascribed to both: But it has been fully shewn^d, that beginningless Duration is asserted concerning the Son; I think, therefore, there can be no rational Doubt, but he intended to prove in these Words the Eternity of the Spirit. Besides, *Irenæus*, as has also been noted, knew of no Creatures pre-existing to the Creation and Beginning of all Things: He distinguisheth the Spirit from all created Beings by his existing, *ante omnem Constitutionem, before any Thing was created*, and by his being the Creator of all Things. To say, *there was a Creature before all Creation*, sounds very like a Contradiction. And by his inferring the Eternity of the Spirit from his being said to have existed with the Father before the Heavens, the Earth, the Hills and Fountains were made, we may with some Certainty suppose, that he understood that Passage, *Psal. xc. 2.* to be expressive of the absolute Eternity of God, and that *to have existed before the beginning of the World*, and to be *without beginning*, or *eternal*, are with him Expressions of the same Import^e.

2. ^f “ The Breath of Life, which made Man
 “ a living Soul, (*Gr.* Animal) is one thing, and
 “ the quickning Spirit, that makes him spiri-
 “ tual, is another. And therefore *Esaias* saith:
 “ Thus saith the Lord, that made Heaven, and
 “ established

^d See Chap. IV. N^o 2.—Chap. V. Prop. II.—Chap. VII. N^o 11. & passim.

^e See the Text, *Prov. viii. 22.* consider'd in a Dissertation at the end of this Appendix.

^f v. 5. 2. Aliud enim est afflatus Vitæ, qui & animalem efficit hominem: Et aliud Spiritus vivificans, qui & spiritalem efficit eum. Et propter hoc *Esaias* ait: Sic dicit Dominus, qui fecit Cælum, & fixit illud, qui firmavit terram,

“ established it, that fixed the Earth, and the
 “ things that are in it, and gave Breath to the
 “ People upon it, and the Spirit to them that
 “ tread on it, Isa. xlii. 5: Intimating, that the
 “ Breath was given in common to all People
 “ upon Earth; but the Spirit peculiarly to those
 “ that trample upon earthly Lusts. Where-
 “ fore the same *Esaïas*, distinguishing the things
 “ already mentioned, saith: *For the Spirit shall*
 “ *proceed from me, and I have made the Breath*
 “ *of all*, Isa. lvii. 16. speaking of the Spirit as
 “ peculiarly belonging to God, and ranking it
 “ with him, who in the last Days poured it out
 “ upon Mankind by the Adoption; but reckon-
 “ ing the Breath in common to the Creation, and
 “ declaring it to be a *made Being*. Now what
 “ was made, must be different from the Ma-
 “ ker. Therefore the Breath is temporary;
 “ but the Spirit is eternal.”

If any one that understands Words will con-
 sider this Passage with tolerable Attention, he
 will find, there is hardly any Possibility of mis-
 taking the Sense, or evading the Force of it.

Our

Et quæ in ea sunt: Et dedit afflatum populo, qui super eam
est; Et Spiritum his qui calcant illum. Afflatum quidem
 communiter omni qui super terram est populo dicens datum:
 Spiritum autem propriè his, qui inculcant terrenas concupis-
 centias. Propter quod rursus ipse *Esaïas* distinguens quæ
 prædicta sunt, ait: *Spiritus enim a me exiet, Et afflatum om-*
nem ego feci, Isa. lvii. 16. Spiritum quidem propriè in Deo
 deputans, quem in novissimis temporibus effudit per adoptio-
 nem filiorum in genus humanum: afflatum autem comuni-
 ter in conditionem, & facturam ostendens illum. Aliud au-
 tem est quod factum est, ab eo qui fecit. Afflatus igitur
 temporalis; Spiritus autem sempiternus, &c. Gr. ἕτερον ἐστὶ
 πνοὴ ζωῆς, ἡ καὶ ψυχικὴ ἀπεργαζομένη τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ ἕτερον
 πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν, τὸ καὶ πνευματικὸν αὐτὸν ἀποτελοῦν καὶ διὰ
 τοῦτο Ἡσυχίας φησὶν ἔτσι λέγει Κύριε. κ. λ. — τὴν μὲν πνοὴν

Our Author shews the Difference between the Breath of Life, and the Holy Spirit of God : By the former, I suppose, he means the human Spirit, by *the breathing of which* into Man at his Creation, he became a *living Soul*, Gen. ii. 7. And hence the natural or animal Man (ψυχικός ἄνθρωπος) is denominated. And there is no room to doubt, but that the *quickning Spirit* is the Holy Ghost, by whose sanctifying Influences Men are made spiritual.

He states the Difference between these two, in these Particulars.

1. The *Afflatus*, or Breath is given indifferently to all, but the Holy Spirit only to the Children of God, who have the Earth under their Feet.

2. The Spirit came forth from God, and is God, but the *Afflatus* is a Creature. This he infers from that Text, *Isa. lvii. 16.* which, according to the Version of the LXX, runs thus : *The Spirit shall proceed from me, and I have made the Breath of all.* His Reasoning on this Passage of the Prophet, is plainly to this Purpose. “ The Spirit is here spoken of, not as *created*,
“ but as *proceeding forth* from God, and opposed to the Spirit of Man, which God *made*.
“ There are but two Orders of Being, God
“ and the Creature : The Spirit belongs not to
“ the later, but to the former ; he is included
“ in God, the uncreated Being, and ranked

παντὶ κοινῶς τῷ ἐπὶ γῆς λαῷ φήσας δέδοται· τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἰδίως καταπατεῦσι τὰς γῶδεις ἐπιθυμίας. Διὸ καὶ πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς Ἡσαΐας διατέλλων τὰ προειρημένα φησὶ· Πνεῦμα ᾧ παρ’ ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται, καὶ πῶς πᾶσαν ἐγὼ ἐπίησα· τὸ πνεῦμα ἰδίως ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ τάξας τοῦ ἐκρέοντος αὐτὸν ——— διὰ τῆς ὑπερθεσίας ἐπὶ τὴν ἀνθρώπων τὴν ἢ πρὸν κοινῶς ἐπὶ τῆς κτίσεως, καὶ ποίημα ἀναγορεύσας αὐτὸν ἕτερον δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ ποιητὴν τοῦ ποιήσαντος· ἢ οὐκ ἀποφύγετο· τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἀέναντον. κ. τ. ε.

“ with

“ with him :” For that is the Sense of the Greek Phrase, ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ τάτλειν, which, when different Orders of Beings are consider’d, as here, is of the same Import with *asserting him to be God* : As ἐν κληρῷ τεταλμίν is one of the Clergy, and ἐν λαῷ τάτλειθαι, is to be a Lay-man. So κατὰ τὰς γεωργίας τάτλειθαι, signifies *to be an Husband-man*. The Latin Phrase used by the Interpreter, carries also the same Sense, *in Deo deputari*, is *to be included in God*, or *spoken of as comprehended in God*, and *one with him*. As Tertullian illustrating the Unity of the Father and Son as God, by the Simile of the Sun and its Rays, says, *Radius in Sole deputatur*, The Rays are included in the Sun^h ; so that, when the Sun is spoken of, they are to be understood as comprehended in, and belonging to it. We may therefore, according to Tertullian, say, *Filius*, or *Spiritus Sanctus in Deo deputatur*, meaning, that the Son and Spirit are so in God, as to be of the same Nature, and to make but one God with him. Besides, what is said of the *Afflatus* or *Breath*, in opposition to the Spirit, fully determines the Sense : For τὴν πνοὴν κοινῶς [τάτλειν] ἐπὶ τῆς κτίσεως, signifies undeniably *to make a Creature of it*, or *to rank it with Creatures*, which is explain’d by declaring it to be a made Thing ; Gr. κ’ ποιήμα ἀναγορεύσας αὐτήν. The Greek found in a Catena on Genesis, shews, that the Latin should be read *Facturam*, which the Sense also requires, as it is published in the *Benedictine Edition* from the *Clermont MS.*

^g Max. Tyr. Dissert. 15. V. eundem Dissert. 1. ἐν ποτίῳ δὴ τῶν φύσεων τέτων (Sc. τῶν νοητῶν ἢ αἰσθητῶν) τὸν Θεὸν τακτέον.

^h Tertull. adv. Praxeam. Cap. 18. Puta Solem dicere : Ego Sol, & alius præter me non est, nisi radius meus ; nonne denotasset vanitatem ; quasi non & *radius in Sole deputatur*.

The Occasion of the Mistake was the Copyist's inadvertently supposing the Word to be joined in Construction with the *Ablative* going before; thus: *Conditione & facturâ*. And I would observe by the *bye*, that the former should not have been alter'd by the Editor, but left, (*in conditione*, which is the proper rendering of, ἐπὶ τῆς κτίσεως, as above, ἐπὶ τῇ Θεῷ, is render'd *in Deo*) as in the vulgar Editions, For τὰς is to be here repeated ἀπὸ κοινῆς, as I have represented it above: The Construction does not depend upon the Verb *Effudit*; which would require, ἐπὶ τὴν κτίσιν, *in conditionem*. He plainly asserts then, that the Spirit is not a Creature, but God, or a divine Person, included in the uncreated Being. This is confirmed by what follows.

3. The Spirit, as the Creator is eternal, but the *Afflatus*, being a Creature, is temporary. After *Ireneus* had proved the Spirit to be God, to shew the vast Difference between him, and the Spirit breathed into Man, he considers him as the *Creator*, and the other as a *made Being*: "The Creature, saith he, must be very different from the Creator:" And then concludes one remarkable Difference between them suited to his Scope, *viz.* the Breath, by which Man lives the animal Life, is only *temporary*; it animates the Body a-while, and then leaves it breathless and dead: But the Spirit of God is *eternal*, and so never fails, but abides for ever in his living Temples, and the spiritual is changed into eternal Life.

As this is plainly the Sense and Argument of this Place, so it agrees with his known Doctrine of the Spirit's being Creator of the World. And he seems to refer to several Scriptures of
that

that Import; as *Psal.* xxxiii. 6. *Job* xxxiii. 4. *The Spirit of God hath made me.* And *Psal.* civ. 30. *Thou sendest forth thy Spirit; and they are created, &c.*

And let it be noted, that he applies the same Reasoning to the Spirit here, that he uses concerning the Son elsewhereⁱ. And according to it, the Spirit also is *unmade and necessarily-existent, is eternal without beginning or end, is independent, self-sufficient, &c.*

What Dr. *Whitby* says of this Passage^k, I chuse for his sake to answer with Silence; there is no body so stupid, as not to see, that he rather deserves Pity, than needs an Answer.

To the same Purpose *Ireneus* elsewhere speaks of the Spirit, as uncreated.

3. ^l “ — The Word that is in the Father, “ gives the Spirit unto all, according to the “ Father’s Pleasure; to some by Creation, and “ that is a *made Thing*: And to some by Adoption, and *that is of God*, which is their Regeneration. And thus it is made out, that “ there is one God the Father, who is over all, “ and thro’ all, and in all. The Father is over “ all, — the Word is thro’ all, — and the “ Spirit in us all.” —

ⁱ See above, Chap. VIII. Prop. IV. N^o 3. Pass. 2. and the same consider’d in the Dissertation concerning ἀγίνεσις.

^k *Disquis. Mod.* p. 129.

^l v. 18. 2. — Et Verbum portatum à Patre, præstat Spiritum omnibus, quemadmodum vult Pater: quibusdam quidem secundum conditionem, quod est factum: quibusdam autem secundum Adoptionem, quod est ex Deo, quod est generatio. Et sic unus Deus Pater ostenditur, qui est super omnia, & per omnia, & in omnibus. Super omnia quidem Pater: — per omnia autem Verbum: — in omnibus autem nobis Spiritus. —

Here is the same Distinction of the Spirit, or *Afflatus*, that is indifferently given to all, and of the Holy Spirit communicated only to the Children of God in their Regeneration. The former is a *Creature*, or *made Thing*; but the later is contra-distinguish'd from it, by being said *to be of God*; which Expression, borrow'd from the Apostle, 1 Cor. ii. 12. τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, must here signify his *being God*, and *uncreated*, as appears by the Opposition between a *made Being*, and *that which is of God*. So that the Preposition (ἐκ) has the same Force and Emphasis here, as in the *Nicene Creed*, Θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ, *God of God*, that is, ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ, *of the Essence of God*, which is the Meaning of the Word ὁμοούσιος, *Consubstantial*. *Irenæus* therefore can mean no less, than that the Spirit is not a *made Being*, but *uncreated* and *Consubstantial* with God the Father. And afterwards he shews, that the Spirit, as well as the Word, is one God with the Father; in which he follows the Apostle in the Context referr'd to, who represents the Spirit, as being *in God*, and intimately conscious of all his Secrets, as *the Spirit of a Man is in a Man*, and *knows the things of Man*, 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11.

The divine Works of *Creation*, *Preservation*, and *Government* of all Things ascribed to the Spirit, prove his Belief of his Godhead.

4. ^m “ There is one God, who by his *Word* and *Wisdom* made and order'd all Things.”—

Let the Reader see more Passages to the same Purpose in the Chapter concerning *the Father*, *Son* and *Spirit*; and compare them with *Ire-*

^m iv. 20. 4. Unus igitur Deus, qui Verbo & Sapientiâ fecit & aptavit omnia.

næus's Doctrine of the Creation of the Worldⁿ, and it will evidently appear, that the creating Spirit can be no Creature, but *uncreated, independent, self-sufficient, absolutely eternal, &c. i. e.* truly and properly God.

5. ° “ When a Grain of Wheat falls into the Earth, and is dissolved, it springs up with great Increase thro’ the Spirit, which contains and upholds all Things.

6. P “ There is one Spirit, that disposeth all Things.”

One Thing is opposed to all this, *viz.* that *Irenæus* says, *That the Father and Son only are styled God and Lord in Scripture*^q.

1 “ No one, saith he, is called God and Lord by the Spirit, but the God, who rules all, together with his Word.”

And in several other Passages produced above, he applies these Titles only to the two first Persons, but not to the Spirit. And this, I suppose, is the only Reason, that some, who were no Enemies to the Doctrine of the Trinity, have blam’d our Author for not plainly declaring his Belief of the Divinity of the Spirit. Concerning this, I observe,

ⁿ See above, Chap. VIII.

° V. 2. 3. Ὁ κέκωθ’ τῷ σίτῃ πεισὼν εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ διαλυεῖς, πολλοὺς ἐγείρει διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ συνεχοντοῦ πᾶντα. —V. Interp. Granum tritici decidens in terram, & dissolutum, multiplex surgit per Spiritum Dei, qui continet omnia.

P iv. 36. 7. —Et unus Dispensator; unus enim Spiritus Dei, qui disponit omnia. Gr. Καὶ εἰς αἰκόνομον, ὃν ἡδὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ διέπει πᾶντα.

^q Vide *Whitby's Disquis. Mod.* p. 128.

1 iv. 1. 1. Cum sit hoc — firmum & constans, neminem alterum Deum & Dominum à Spiritu prædicatum, nisi eum qui dominatur omnium Deus, cum Verbo suo. —

1. That he had not Occasion to say so much of the Holy Spirit, as of the Son; for he contented himself to consider and confute the first Rank of imaginary *Æons*, which contain'd the eight primary ones, as being the Basis and Foundation of the whole *Plerôma*. In this he met with two Denominations of the second Person, viz. *the Only-begotten*, and the *Word*; but none of the Holy Ghost. And yet, tho' it was not his Purpose to establish and explain the Christian Scheme, but as he was led to it by opposing his Adversaries, enough has been said to shew, that he has fully express'd his Belief of the Deity of the Sacred Spirit.

2. He is not inconsistent with himself, when he proves *the Father and Son only to be called God and Lord*; for he uses that Argument only affirmatively, to shew, that the Father and his Word are God and Lord in the proper and primary Sense; but not to deny and disprove the Deity of the Holy Ghost: nor can he be excluded according to the Primitive Scheme, when the Father as God is spoken of; for by comparing him and *Tertullian*, we have observed, that *the Spirit is included in God, as the Rays in the Sun, (Spiritus in Deo deputatur, sicut Radius in Sole.)*

3. But one single Observation will, I think, fully solve this Difficulty: And it arises from a Consideration of the Oeconomy of Persons in the ever-blessed Trinity, as understood by our Author. The Son is sent into the World by the Father; and his Business is not to glorify himself, but the Father; agreeably to this Design he taught his Disciples, that the *Father only is God and Lord*^s, as has been observed. In

^s iii. 9. 1. — Et ipso Domino Patrem tantum Deum & Dominum eum, qui solus est Deus, & Dominator omnium, tradente discipulis. —

like manner the Holy Spirit is sent forth by the Father and Son to glorify them, not himself, *Job. xvi. 14. He (the Spirit) shall glorify me;* saith our Saviour, who had veiled his own Glory. Now there is an exact Parallel in the Case: The Son teaches, that the Father only is God and Lord; and none is stiled so *by the Spirit*, but the Father and Son. As therefore it is certain, from *Irenæus*, that the Son abstain'd from these Titles, not because they did not belong to him, but because he was not *to seek his own Glory, but his who sent him, Job. vii. 18.* So the Spirit is not stiled God and Lord, according to him, *by himself*; not because he is not truly God and Lord, but because he was not to witness of himself, but of the Father and Son. And it is the Spirit that inspired the Prophets and Apostles, and is the Author of the Scripture. And this seems to be the Reason, according to this Father, that the Holy Ghost is so seldom *expressly and personally* stiled God in Sacred Writ.

A

DISSERTATION

On P R O V. VIII. 22.

Read by the Fathers in the Version of the
 LXX. Κύριος ἐκτίσέν με Ἀρχὴν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ. κ. τ. ε.
That is, The Lord created me the begin-
ning of his Ways, &c.

THIS celebrated Text, generally under-
 stood by the Antients of the Son, is by
Irenæus apply'd to the Holy Spirit; where-
 in, tho' he differs from most others, he is very
 consistent with himself: for he often stiles the
 Spirit the *Wisdom of God*, as contra-distinguish'd
 from the *Word of God*.

The original *Hebrew*, which alone is authen-
 tic, has no Difficulty in it. יהוה קנני ראשית
 "גו" That is, *Jehova possessed me the beginning*
of his Way, &c. It has been well observed by
 some, that the Word (קנה) signifies to acquire
 by *Price, Industry*, or even by *Generation*; for
 so it is used by our common Mother, Gen. iv. 1.
 קניתי *I have gotten*, (viz. by *Generation*) *a Man*
from the Lord. And the same Word (in *Hipbil*)
 is render'd *to beget* by the LXX themselves,
 Zeck xiii. 5. — ὅτι ἄνθρωπος ἐγέννησέν με ἐκ νεότη-
 τός μου, *For a Man begat me (הקנני) from my*
Youth. However, the Expression must here sig-
 nify the Son's *eternal Co-existence* and *ineffable*
Union with the Father: *The Lord possessed me,*
 2 that

that is, he had me in, and with himself as his Wisdom, which he never could be without.

But the *Greek Version*, ascribed to the LXX Interpreters, has a harsh Expression here, that the *Arians* made much use of: κύριος ἐκτίσέ με. κ. λ. as represented above: *The Lord created me the beginning of his Ways*. This rendering has occasion'd all the Difficulty; for this Translation was in common Use and greatest Repute among the Fathers in the *Greek Church*; and the old *Italic Version*, and others used by the *Latines* before *Jerome's* Time were taken from it.

Now considering, that the Word ἐκτίσῃ is not expressive of the true Sense of the *Hebrew*; that these celebrated Interpreters almost every where else render it otherwise; that *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, and *Theodotion* agree in rendering it, ἐκλήσατο,—possessed; and that the Subject here spoken of, and Circumstances of the Place could not possibly tempt the LXX to depart from the Propriety of the Word, and their usual rendering of it; for the *creating of Wisdom* is at least an uncouth Expression, especially in speaking of that *Wisdom*, which was with the Father before the Creation, and by which he made the World: Considering all this, I say, I am inclin'd to suspect an Interpolation or Mistake of Transcribers here; and suppose the antient Interpreters left, ἐκλήσατό με, in their Copy; but that it was first changed into ἐκτίσατο, as it is found in *Philo* to this very Day^a. If he wrote it ἐκλήσατο, he probably found it so at least in some Copies of the LXX; for being an *Alexandrian Jew*, 'tis most probable, he took it from that Version,

^a Philo Jud. de Temulent. p. 244. Ὁ Θεὸς ἐκλήσατό με πρῶτῃ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἔργων, καὶ πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐδημελίωσέ με.

which was of greatest Authority among his Countrymen, or rather the only one then extant: And had he chose to render it by the Verb κλιζω, I am persuaded he would have used the active Voice, ἐκλίσει, and not ἐκλίσατο in an unusual Form. Or if he really left it, as it is now read, which I hardly believe, it is not likely that he did it without the Authority of some Copies. On the former Supposition, it is a probable direct Proof from the earliest Citation of the Text, that it was originally ἐκλήσατο in the LXX Version; and at the same time affords an Instance of the easy interchange of ἐκλήσατο and ἐκλίσατο; which later was, perhaps, presum'd to be right, because conformable to the modern Text of the LXX. And the later Supposition shews, how early ἐκλίσατο, (put, no doubt, for ἐκλήσατο) by an easy slip crept into the Copies. And ἐκλίσατο, as unusual, would of course be changed into ἐκλίσει, as it appears at this Day. However, the two Words have been interchanged elsewhere by a manifest Error of Copyists: An Instance of which we have; *Jer.* xxxii. 15. ἐτι κληθήσονται ἀγροί. κ. τ. ε. (Heb. עֵדֶן יִקְנוּ וְגו') without all doubt, it should be κληθήσονται, *Fields shall be purchased, or possessed*; as appears by the *Alexandrian* Copy, and the 43^d Verse of the same Chapter. And in *Psal.* civ. 24. it is observable, that κλίσεως is put for κλήσεως, as the *Hebrew* Word signifies, and is render'd in the following *Psalms* cv. 21. And yet *this* Error is so antient, that it is got into several old Versions from the LXX. Indeed, the Word (קָנָה) *Gen.* xiv. 19 and 22, is paraphrased, in our modern Copies, by ὃς ἐκλίσει, *who created Heaven and Earth*; and it is by Creation that God is become the Owner or Possessor of all

all Things. But 'tis very possible, this might have been *ὅς ἐκλήσατο* at first, as the Word is almost constantly render'd in other Places: For often the Sense of the Places, as well as the Affinity of the Words, has occasion'd their being interchanged by Copyists, ignorant of the Hebrew. *He that purchased, or possessed Heaven and Earth*, is an uncommon Expression; and consequently would be apt to be changed into, *the Creator of Heaven and Earth*, by which God is commonly describ'd ^b. *Philo* indeed has it now, *ὅς ἐκτίσε*; but by his Paraphrase of the Words one would be apt to suppose, that he had *ὅς ἐκλήσατο* in his Eye: For thus he makes *Abraham* speak; *I will take nothing from you, but from God, who is Possessor of all Things* ^c. He says, *κτίσματα*, not *κλίσματα*.

However, if this Version of *Prov.* viii. 22. be corrupted, it was done very early. And, perhaps, this Change was owing to the *Hellenistical Jews of Alexandria*, who were tinctur'd with some Speculations of the *Platonic School*, and soon began to speak of divine Things in the Dialect of *Plato*. Hence the Son of *Sirach* has these bold Expressions concerning Wisdom:

^b So the Greek Word *ὕϊον*, in *Psal.* xvii. 14. was changed into *ὕαν* or *ὕειον*, because *being filled with Children*, was an Expression odd and unusual among the *Greeks*; and by a very small Alteration it was made to signify *being filled with Swine's Flesh or Pork*, which is an obvious expression, and represented the Persons described, as impious and abominable to the *Jews*. So this Reading is follow'd by both the *Arabic* Versions and the *Roman Psalter*. Thus also, *Salis ardore*, was changed into *Solis ardore* in the vulgar *Latin*, *Deut.* xxix. 23.

^c *Philo* Jud. de Temulent. p. 255. — Ἐκτενὴν τὴν χεῖρά μου πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν τὸν ὑψίστον, ὃς ἐκτίσει τὸν ἕρμανόν. κ. τ. ε.

Et post pauca: p. 256. B. — Παρ' ὑμῶν μὲν οὐδέν, παρὰ δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ λήψομαι, εὗ τὰ πάντα κτίσματα. κ. τ. ε.

πρωτέρα

πρὸ πάντων ἐκλίσαι σοφία, *Wisdom was created before all Things*, Eccclus. i. 4. And again : *Before all Ages, even from the beginning he created me*, saith *Wisdom*, chap. xxiv. 14. And yet they did not mean *proper Creation* by these Expressions, as may be observed hereafter.

But whatever was the Original rendering of this Verse, it is certain most of the Fathers read ἐκλίσε in their Copies. For tho' *Origen* once has this Passage according to the Original^c, *the Lord possessed me*, &c. And it is certain, he does not cite the Words from any of the other famous Greek Versions, as may be observed by comparing them in the Margin^f: Yet we cannot, perhaps, with any Certainty infer from hence, that he found it so in any Copies of the LXX. He might correct the vulgar Translation from the Original, and by comparing the other Versions with it. And yet I think it not improbable, that this learned and industrious Father, who was qualify'd to be the Author of that laborious Work, called *Hexapla* and *Octapla*, might have found it, as cited by him, in some antient and more correct MSS. But be this as it will, I shall demonstrate, that the Fathers did not understand this Verse in the *Arian* Sense by two Observations.

1. They did not take the Word ἐκλίσε in its proper Sense for *creating*.

^c Orig. Comment. in Mat. p. 470. Ed. Huet. Ὁ Θεὸς ἐκτίσάτο με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ, πρὸ τοῦ τι ποιῆσαι, καὶ πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐπεμελίωσε με ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸ τοῦ τὴν γῆν παῖνσαι.
x. τ. ε.

^f Aquila. Κύριος ἐκτίσάτο με ἀρχὴν κατεργασμάτων αὐτοῦ. Sym. — ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸ τῆς ἐργασίας αὐτοῦ. Theod. — πρὸ τῆς ἐργασίας αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τότε, καὶ ἐκ τότε πρὸ αἰῶνος περικυρίσμαι.

They

They might take it as expressive of the mysterious Generation of the Son; which they were led to, not only by the Nature of the Subject, but by the Context it self; for as it would be a Contradiction to say, *Wisdom was created before any thing was made*; so the Word is explain'd by *begetting*, v. 25. *before all the Hills, he begat me*. And Origen, who was so much suspected of favouring the Notions afterwards embrac'd by the *Arians*, tho' unjustly, does yet explain this Expression of *Begetting* of eternal Generation^g; and compares it to the necessary Emanation of the Light or Brightness of the Sun^h.

And lest any should wonder, that *this Expression of Creating*, and others of the like Import, should seem tolerable, and capable of an Orthodox Meaning to the good Fathers, I would desire the Reader to observe,

1. That Generation in the common Acceptation is often expressed in Words much to the same Purpose. As *τεκνοποιεῖν*, *create*, *procreate*, *facere*, &c. *We make Children*, saith Tertullian, *even tho' we beget them*ⁱ. The Instances are innumerable, and known even to School-boys; so that one would wonder what the Author of the *Disquisitiones Modestæ* meant by producing

^g Comment. in Joh. p. 31. A. ὅτι ἡ τὸ ὕιός μου ἔστι σὺν, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε, λέγεται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃ αἰετὶς τὸ σήμερον, οὐκ ἐστὶν ἢ ἐσπερά Θεοῦ, ἐγὼ ἡ γυνῶμαι ὅτι οὐδὲ πρῶτα, ἀλλ' ὁ συμπαρεκκλινῶν τῇ ἀγενήτῳ καὶ αἰδίῳ αὐτοῦ ζωῇ. ἢ ἔτις ἔπω, χροῖον, ἡμέρα ἐστὶν αὐτῷ σήμερον, ἐν ᾗ γεγέννηται ὁ υἱός· ἀρχῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ οὕτως ἔκ ἐκτισκομένης, ὡς οὐδὲ τ' ἡμέρας.

Confer eundem Hom. 9. in Jerem. p. 106.

^h Ibid.

ⁱ Adv. Hermog. C. 32. — Ut credas abyssum quoque genitum, id est factum, quia & filios facimus, licet genere-

this Sentence out of *Lactantius*, in favour of *Arianism*, viz. *Deus creatus sine opere Genitoris*^k; Words utterly uncapable of the false Meaning, he intended his inadvertent Reader should suppose, they carry'd in them; for he put them in another Character, and in his *Reply to Dr. Waterland* without blushing sets down these Words, *Deus Creatus*^l, as an Instance of the Son's being called a *Creature*, with respect to his divine Nature. But I am persuaded, there is not an *Arian* in the World so stupid, as to refer this Expression, either to the Generation of the *Logos*, or to his *being made God* in their Sense; for they suppose both to be done by the Father; and so not *sine opere Genitoris*, without a Father. As the very mention of a Father carries a reference to some Birth; so 'tis impossible the Words should refer to any thing, but his being *born of the Virgin*, in respect of which he was ἀπάτωρ, without Father.

2. The Fathers were accustomed to the Language of the Philosophers and others, who express'd the operation of necessary Causes by Words of the like Import. Some of the Philosophers held, that there were several Beings, among which some reckon'd the World it self, that necessarily, and eternally co-existed with God, and are therefore said to be ἀγέννητα, of whose Existence God is the Fountain: And yet he is stiled their Cause, Author, Maker, &c. αἰτία, αἰτιότης, ποιητής. κ. λ. And is said γεννᾶν, παρᾶγειν, ποιεῖν, &c. to beget, produce, make them, &c.^m And, which is still more surprising, they

^k Disquis. Mod. p. 101.

^l p. 74.

^m Sallust. de Diis & mundo. C. 13. p. 266. — Δυνάμει μὲν ἐν παντί ποιῶν ἑαυτῷ συνφίσει πάντα.

they stuck not to use the same Words concerning the self-existent Being, saying that he was the *Cause of his own Being, self-produced*, that *he made himself*, &c. Concerning this, the Reader may consult *Plotinus*ⁿ, and the Author of the *Quæstiones ad Græcos*, among *Justin Martyr's* Works^o. I should have inclined to put a favourable Construction upon this odd Speculation, which in its obvious Meaning is a downright Contradiction: I have query'd, whether they might not conceive of the *Necessity of the Existence of God*, as *Prior* in order of *Nature*, not of *Duration*, to the Being of God, exerting it self eternally in the actual Existence of God. And because every thing in God is God himself, they might consider this Necessity, as God himself acting upon himself, and by an eternal Act necessitating his own Existence^p. But Candor it self can hardly frame an Excuse for them.—And, perhaps, this Speculation might origi-

Hierocle. de Provident. ex Phot. L. 2. p. 262. Ed. Needh.
κατ' ἑσῶαν ἐκείνα λέγεται ποιεῖν. κ. τ. ε.

Quæst. ad Græcos inter opera Just. M. Quæst. 2. — ποιεῖ τῶν [ὁ Θεός] τὸν κόσμον ἐν αὐτῷ τετὰ ὅπερ ἐστὶ. — ποιεῖ — τὸν κόσμον πάντων αὐτὸν αἰεὶ, καὶ ὁ κόσμος τῷ μὲν αἰεὶ φερεῖσθαι γίνεται, τῷ δ' αἰεὶ εἶναι ὁ αὐτός, ἀγέννητος ὑπάρχει. Quæst. 3. — ὁ Θεὸς ἀγέννητος ὢν, ἀγενήτως ποιεῖ πάντα ἐ γινόμενα, ἀλλὰ συνυφιστάμενα.

Origen. Comment. in Jerem. Hom. 9. ad fin. p. 106. Ed. Huet. — ὅτι τὸ φῶς ποιητικὸν τῷ ἀπαυγασματι.

ⁿ Plotin. Ennead. 6. L. 8. à Cap. 13. ad finem — C. 13. p. 748. — ὥστε αὐτὸν πεποιηκέναι αὐτὸν, ὁ λόγος ἀνεῦρεν. — C. 14. καὶ αὐτομάτῃ καὶ συμβάσει αἰτίον ἑαυτοῦ καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ δι' αὐτὸν αὐτός. — & Cap. seq. p. 750. — αὐτός ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ ποιῶν ἑαυτὸν καὶ κύριος ἑαυτοῦ. &c.

^o Quæst. 3. p. 224. Ed. Steph. — διὰ τὸ αὐτοπάρεκτον εἶναι τὸν Θεόν.

^p This, I think, is countenanc'd by *Simplicius's* Definition of self-existent Beings, viz. *such as have the Cause or Ground*
A a of

originally arise from the *Jewish* Tradition of *Generation in God* deliver'd obscurely, and misunderstood by the Philosophers. However that be, I mention this here only to shew, that the Harshness of such Expressions was much soften'd, and qualify'd to those Fathers that were accus-tom'd to the Language of the Schools in their Day: And having an *Author* or *Cause*, and *being produced*, was not in *some Sense* apprehended to be inconsistent with the Idea of a necessary Being: And since they consider'd the Generation of the *Logos* as an eternal and necessary Emanation of the Son from the Father, 'tis a Wonder they did not *often* use these Terms to express it. If it was commonly said, that the self-existent God was αἰτιῶν ἑαυτῷ τὸ εἶναι, *the Cause of his own Being*, no Wonder, that *Justin Martyr*, a converted Philosopher, should think the Son's eternal Generation of the Father would authorise him, in saying, *The Father is the Cause of the Son's Being* ⁹, &c. αἰτιῶν αὐτῷ τὸ εἶναι, καὶ δυνατῷ, καὶ κυρίῳ, καὶ Θεῷ. If *Josephus* could conform to the Sense of the Schools, by calling God somewhere ἔργον ἑαυτῷ, *his own*

of their Existence in themselves, and not without them. —
 Ἀγέννητα πάντεσσι ὄντα, αὐτὴν αὐτοῖς ἔχοντα τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ εἶναι, καὶ οὐκ ἔχοντες. Comment. in Epist. p. 202.

So that, perhaps, the Philosophers might mean no more than Dr. *Clarke* does in his *Demonstration a priori*, tho' they express'd themselves more uncautiously. Besides, 'tis possible, that the Terms, αὐτογενής, αὐτοφύης, &c. signifying no more at first than *self-existent*, might, thro' the Mistake and Subtily of some mystical Philosophers, produce this monstrous Speculation of *God's causing his own Existence*.

And certainly *Lactantius* did not take the Opinion of the Philosophers right, who grossly adds to it, *that God had a beginning*. De falsâ Relig. L. 1. p. 18. Ed. Cant.

⁹ Con. Tryph. p. 358. D.

Work, and Plotinus said, that the *Act of Willing* is from God, and as it were his *Work*, ἡ βούλησις παρ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς ἔργον αὐτοῦ; we need not wonder, that *Tatian*, a Philosopher also, should call the *Word*, an eternal Emanation of the infinite Mind, or his being sent forth to create the World, ἔργον πρωτότοκον τῷ πατρὶ, or τῷ πνεύματι, as it is commonly read^t. And yet, when *Origen* ventur'd to use the Word κλιζω, in this Case, he was so sensible of the Impropriety and Harshness of it, that he qualifies it by putting in, *If I may so speak* ^u.

3. But, I suppose, the Fathers generally took the Sense of the Word ἐκτίσσει, in *Proverbs*, from the Hellenistical Greek, as signifying to appoint or constitute. That it was commonly used in this Sense, appears from several Passages in *Siracides*, *Hate not laborious Work*, saith he, and *Husbandry created*, (i. e. appointed) by the most high^w. Again: *Give place to the Physician*, for *God hath created* (ordained) him^x. And the Apostle *Peter's* ἀνθρώπινη κλίσις must be taken in the same Sense for an *human Ordinance* or *Constitution*^y. *Eusebius* of *Cæsarea*, a Person well vers'd in the Writings of the *Ante-nicene* Fa-

^t Ennead. 6. L. 8. C. 13. p. 748.

^u Conf. Damasc. de Fid. Orth. L. 1. C. viii. p. 133. ἡ μὲν γέννησις ἀναρχὴ καὶ αἰδιό, φύσεως ἔργον αὖσα, καὶ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας προάγουσα, &c.

^v Orat. Con. Græc. p. 145.

^w Comment. in Johan. p. 19. Καὶ λεκτέον ὅτι κήσας (L. κτίσας) ἢ ἄτως ἔπερ, (L. ἔπα), ἔμπυχον σοφίαν ὁ Θεός, αὐτῇ ἐπέτερεψεν. κ. τ. ε.

^x Eccclus. vii. 17. Μὴ μισήσῃς ἐπιπόνον ἐργασίαν, καὶ γεωργίαν ὑπὸ ὑψίστῃ ἐκτισμένην.

^y Cap. 38. 12. Καὶ ἰατρῷ δις τόπον, καὶ ἂν αὐτὸν ἐκτίσει κῆρι. Conf. v. 1.

^z 1 Pet. ii. 13.

thers, and never suspected of Partiality to the Orthodox in this Point, has, I think, truly represented the Sense of the Antients in his Exposition of this Text in his Books against *Marcellus*². “*Tho’ he (the Son) says, he was created, saith he, speaking of this Text, he does not mean, as if he had come into Being out of a State of Non-existence, or as if he also had been made out of nothing, like the other Creatures, as some have erroneously imagin’d: But that having a Subsistence and Life, and being pre-existent to the Creation of the whole World, he was constituted by the Lord his own Father, the Governor of the Universe; creating being here put for constituting and appointing, &c.* *Athenagoras* also plainly applies this Text to the Son’s coming forth to create, to which he was pre-existent, and expressly guards against the Error of his being made, or having a beginning of Existence².

2. ’Tis obvious to observe from this Account of the Text, that the *Ante-nicene* Writers did not refer the force of the Verb *ἐκτίσσε*, to the *Essence* or *Existence* of Wisdom, or the *Logos*, but to what immediately follows, *viz.* what the Son was *made* or *appointed* to be by the Father. For they did not stop at, *the Lord created me, or*

² Con. Marcel. L. 3. & apud Socrat. H. E. L. 2. C. 21. ----
 εἰ ἢ λέγει ἐκπίσσει ἑαυτὸν, ὅχ ὡς ἐκ τοῦ μη ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι παρελθὼν ταῦτα αὐτὸς εἶποι, ὅδ’ ὡς τοῖς λοιποῖς κτίσμασι καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκ τοῦ μη ὄντος ὁμοίως γεγονώς, ὅ τινες οὐκ ὀρθῶς ὑπελήφασιν· ἀλλ’ ὡς ὑφ’ ἑαυτοῦ μὲν καὶ ζῶν, προὐν τε καὶ προὑπάρχων τῆς τοῦ πάντος κόσμου συστάσεως· ἀρχεῖν ἢ τῶν ὅλων ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ αὐτοῦ πατρὸς κατατεταγμένον· τοῦ ἐκτίσσει ἐνταῦθα, ἀντὶ τοῦ κατέταξεν ἢ κατέστησεν εἰρημένον. Confule locum.

² Legat. pp. 38, 41. Ed. Oxon. Πρῶτον γέννημα εἶναι τῷ πατρὶ, οὐχ ὡς γεγόμενον, — ἀλλ’ ὡς — παρελθόντων συνάδει ἢ τῇ λόγῳ καὶ τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα, κύριον γὰρ, φησὶν, ἐκτίσσει με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ. κ. λ.

read the Verse, *the Lord created me in the beginning*, &c. But they carry'd on the Sense thus : *The Lord created me the beginning*, or the Prince and Governor, &c. There is as much Difference between these two Expressions, as between saying, *The King created the Honourable Mr. Bridges*; and this Expression; *The King created Mr. Bridges a Peer of Great Britain, or Duke of Chandois*. 'Αρχὴ was understood to be a Title of Honour belonging to the Son, as the Head and Governor of the whole Creation : Thus *Philo* styles the first of the two supreme Powers, *the Beginning*, or *Principality*^b. It is plain therefore, that the Meaning of the Text, according to the Fathers, was, that the Son by the Father's Will went forth to create the World, or the Father made and constituted him, who was ever with him, the Creator and Lord of the Universe : So *Eusebius* expounds it, as we have seen. Thus Christ is said *to be made unto us Wisdom*, &c. 1 Cor. i. 30. And *Hierocles* says, that the good Man makes his Soul an Image of God, and frames his Mind to be a Temple for the Reception of the divine Light^c.

^b De Sacrific. Abelis & Caini. p. 139. — Ὁ Θεὸς δορυφορεῖται ὑπὸ δυνάμεων τῶν ἀνωτάτων δυνάμεων, Ἀρχὴς τε αὐτὸ καὶ ἀγαθότης. κ. λ.

^c In Aur. Carm. p. 24. Ed. Needh. Ὁ ἁγάλμα Θεῶν τεταίραν τὴν ἑαυτῆ ψυχὴν, καὶ ναὸν εἰς ὑποδοχὴν τῆ θεῖα φωτὸς τῇ ἑαυτῆ παρασκευάζων νοῦν.



BOOKS *Printed for* JOHN CLARK
and RICHARD HETT, *at the Bible*
and Crown in the Poultry.

I. **T**Hirteen Sermons concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity. Preached at the Merchants-Lecture, at *Salters-Hall*. Together with a Vindication of that celebrated Text, 1 *John* v. 7. from being spurious; and an Explication of it, upon the Supposition of its being Genuine: In four Sermons, preach'd at the same Lecture, *An.* 1719, 1720. By EDMUND CALAMY, D.D.

II. The Doctrine of the blessed Trinity stated and defended by some *London* Ministers.

III. The Christian Doctrine of the Trinity; or Father, Son, and Spirit, three Persons and one God, asserted and proved; with their divine Rights and Honours vindicated by plain Evidence of Scripture, without the Aid or Incumbrance of human Schemes. Written chiefly for the use of private Christians. By I. WATTS.

IV. By the same Author; seven Dissertations on the same Subject. In Two Parts.

V. A Vindication of the true Deity of our blessed Saviour ; in Answer to a Pamphlet, intitled, An humble Enquiry into the Scripture Account of Jesus Christ, &c. By JOSEPH BOYSE. The Third Edition.

VI. Twenty-eight Sermons concerning Offences, Revilings, and a Confession of Faith ; preach'd at *Pinner's-Hall*.

VII. The Power of Christ over Plagues and Health, and his Name, as the God of *Israel*, consider'd ; as Arguments of his supreme Deity. In ten Sermons ; the two last by THOMAS BRADBURY.

VIII. An Attempt to prove the Godhead of Christ, by settling the Sense of a single Text, *viz.* *John* xx. 28. *My Lord and my God*. In a Sermon preach'd at *Norwich*, Feb. 27, 1725-6. By THOMAS SCOTT. With a Preface by the Reverend Mr. I. WATTS.

IX. The Holy Spirit a divine Person ; or the Doctrine of his Godhead represented, as evident and important, in several practical Sermons, on *1 Cor.* xii. 11. By JOHN GUYSE.

X. Some plain and short Arguments from Scripture, proving the Lord Jesus Christ to be the supreme God, or one and the same God with the Father, notwithstanding his acknowledged Inferiority to the Father, with respect to his human Nature and Mediatorship. The seventh Edition. Price 2 d. or 12 s. a Hundred.



In the Press, and will shortly be published,

1. Sermons on various Subjects. Vol. III.
By the Reverend Mr. I. WATTS.
2. Several Discourses on Justification. By the
late Reverend RICHARD TAYLOR, A. M.







